



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for August 1977

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND | <i>Vincent P. Miceli, S.J.</i> |
| THE GROWING MILITARY STRENGTH
OF THE USSR | <i>John Eppstein</i> |
| TESTAMENT OF FAITH | <i>The Editor</i> |
| SUFFERING FOR
POINT OMEGA | <i>Joseph F. Coleman</i> |
| TO TOE OR DRAW
THE LINE? | <i>Rev. Bryan Houghton</i> |
| AUTHORITY WITHOUT TEETH? | <i>Rev. Francis Moss</i> |

Please Note

how kind it is and how helpful if you renew your subscription on the first reminder. Those who wait for the third add very greatly to the cost of producing *Christian Order* — all the more so in view of rising costs of postage.

Contents

Page		
50	PERILOUSLY ASKEW	The Editor
53	DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND	Vincent P. Miceli, S.J.
60	TESTAMENT OF FAITH	The Editor
67	SUFFERING FOR POINT OMEGA	Joseph F. Coleman
72	THE GROWING MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE U.S.S.R.	John Eppstein
80	THEN AND NOW: CRANMER RIDES AGAIN	Rev. A. F. Chadwick
86	TO TOE OR DRAW THE LINE?	Rev. Bryan Houghton
95	OUR ACCEPTANCE OF AUTHORITY	Henry Edwards
104	ANY QUESTIONS?	William Lawson, S.J.
107	BOOK REVIEW	Rev. Francis Moss

You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning **Christian Order** should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to **Christian Order** is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:
U.S.A., Canada
India, etc. — £4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand — £4.50, N.Z. \$8.00.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 18

AUGUST, 1977

NUMBER 8

Perilously Askew

THE EDITOR

IN AN address last April to the Assembly of the British Council of Churches, Cardinal Hume reportedly expressed concern that "there was on the one hand apparent general public apathy over institutional religion in Britain today while there was at the same time a great yearning for spiritual things" (Times 28/4/77).

I would have thought that part of the answer to the paradox raised by the Cardinal was to be found in the first part of Clifford Longley's short report of the proceedings of the Assembly in London of representatives of the B.C.C. which the Cardinal addressed. There, the Times Religious Correspondent reports that:

"The British Government is to be urged by the churches to work for a mandatory international embargo on arms for South Africa. At its assembly in London yesterday the British Council of Churches decided that the time had come to close the net that military supplies and assistance had been getting through.

"The Council was told that there was evidence that British arms and military spare parts were still reaching South Africa. They were passing through third countries, or else were manufactured under licence abroad."

What you have here I would suggest is over-concern with the secular; by which I mean the elevation to a position of primary and constant Church concern of the social betterment of mankind, sought increasingly, not for God's sake, but for its own; not because of the Churches' love of God, but by way of substitute for it. Under such circumstances and inevitably Christianity becomes empty of that supernatural content, which is its essence. It appears as false to its primary and supernatural purpose, which is to bring men not bread, but the Bread of Life, the Grace of God which sets them on the way to Heaven.

It would appear, then, that the paradox to which the Cardinal made reference in his address is more apparent than real. If institutional religion meets with apathy at a time when men and women—especially, perhaps, the young—are hungering for spiritual things, the reason is found in the failure of institutional religion — so clearly demonstrated during past years — to give them the spiritual things for which they hunger. There is no mystery in this answer. It is devastatingly simple. I am sure it is true.

In corroboration one need only look at the progressively desupernaturalised or secular tone which appears to have overtaken the expression of Catholic belief in, for example, devotional and liturgical practice, in religious and moral teaching, in the field of missionary endeavour. In the language of the moment, the horizontal has taken over to the point where the vertical appears as of increasingly small account. More and more, man appears as sought for his own sake; not loved for God's.

What I find additionally disturbing is the apparent inability of Authority in the Church to see the downslide of the past ten years as linked directly with the progressive relegation to second place during this time of the Church's primarily supernatural purpose, which is, quite simply, the salvation of souls. I think any impartial investigation would find this to be so. Yet Church Authority, apparently, is unaware of it. As a result, the remedies it proposes appear, for the most part, as largely without supernatural content. That is called for, as a rule, is improved organization — constant talk of community, teams, commissions, feed-back and the like. Very rarely is there any mention of prayer, of devotion, of that simple love of Christ Our Lord and His

Mother, which has sustained the Church throughout history. The emphasis now appears to be the other way — man and his condition, not God and His love. This is why the young are leaving the Church, whilst seminaries starve empty. The Faithful know this. Church Authority, apparently, does not. For, if it did, it would redress, surely, the balance which is so patently and so perilously askew.

CORRECTIVE

In *Christian Order* for May of this year (p.289), we wrote: " . . . Laménais never lacked disciples. Rosmini was his counterpart in Italy, with his works placed on the Index in 1849. He dreamed of reconciling the Church with the Revolution of 1848 and saw Christianity as viable, in the last analysis, only within liberal institutions . . . "

We are happy to publish this passage, from a letter written by Rosmini to Laménais during the latter's tragic days. It has been sent us by Father Anthony Hayes of the Institute of Charity. It runs as follows:

"Let us persuade ourselves, my dear brother, that nothing is necessary to Christ and to his Church. Let us priests in these perilous times hear the voice of Christ: 'et vos vulgum abire'? And let our answer be unanimous: 'Domine, ad quod egressi sumus'? If we abandon Christ and the Church what refuge will we find? Withdrawing ourselves from a spiritual order of things isn't it possible that we shall become restricted to a purely temporal order? And what can a priest of Jesus Christ hope to find in a purely temporal order? He won't even be satisfied. He is like a person who, having lost his way, is straying in a rough desert. He will either die of hunger or be devoured by wild beasts".

We are pleased to present this passage which redresses any unfavourable balance that may have come from what we wrote originally. — The Editor.

It is with a mixture of joy and sadness that we publish this article by Fr. Vincent Miceli, S.J. Joy for the life of Dietrich von Hildebrand; sadness because he has gone from among us. On a more personal note, his strong support for Christian Order meant a great deal to its Editor. Shortly before his death, we had the privilege of publishing an article from his pen.

Dietrich von Hildebrand (1889-1977)

Philosopher and Prophet of Truth

VINCENT P. MICELI, S.J.

DIETRICH VON HILDEBRAND, son of the famous sculptor Adolf von Hildebrand, was born on October 13th, 1889 in Florence, Italy where his father was working at the art. He passed his first eight years in Florence, a city he fondly loved all his life. Italian was the first language he spoke, being as proficient in it as the scholarly natives. From the age of eight to sixteen he spent six months in Florence and six months in Munich where his father was creating three magnificent sculpted fountains, today the marvel of all who view them. Because of constant travel, Dietrich was taught by special tutors and completed his studies in rhetoric at the age of sixteen. Then he went off to the University of Munich.

There he met Max Scheler whose genius and personality were a deep inspiration to him. Already at nineteen years of age von Hildebrand was critical of some of Scheler's

philosophical positions. From Munich he went to Goettingen and studied under Edmund Husserl and Adolf Reinach. He attained his doctorate in 1912. That same year he married Margarete Denck and they had one son, Franz. In 1914 he and his wife were converted to Catholicism. He obtained a teaching position at the University of Munich where he lectured from 1919 to 1933. During these years he had already undertaken a prophetic crusade against totalitarian ideologies. For, in the fall of 1923, when the Nazis attempted their Putsch in Munich, he had to flee for his life. The Nazis sought to kill him for his public opposition to their grotesque philosophy of racism.

God had given von Hildebrand an all-consuming love for truth. Throughout his long life of 87 years he never compromised on truth. God also endowed him with a remarkable vision of mind that discerned at once the nature and morality of the metaphysical, moral, religious and political movements of his day. In advance of almost everyone else, he grasped and exposed the errors and evils of Nazism and Communism. Even when vast numbers of his fellow Christians — bishops, priests, intellectuals and men of good will — hailed the coming to power of Hitler, von Hildebrand raised his voice and plied his pen against this tyrant and the he stood for. Von Hildebrand revealed to his countrymen how man is never content with merely forsaking the fountains of living water in Christianity, but moves on to the broken cisterns as substitutes. Nazism and Communism were the broken cisterns hewn by the enemies of God and man; these cisterns could neither hold water nor sustain life. They would produce a deluge of death and destruction. Unfortunately, too many Christians, like the Israelites of old, were casting off God and his revelations in Christ. They refused to listen to God's prophets and fell down before the idols of racism, totalitarianism and militarism. Von Hildebrand had come too soon with his message of warning; he was too far ahead of his time. The people were living in the delirium of national exaltation and could foresee nothing but victory and prosperity on the horizon. This prophetic doom was a nuisance and a traitor to Pan-Germanism. Not only was he not listened to, he was opposed. Von Hildebrand decided to flee Germany and to fight for his country as an exile. Then began his perilous Odyssey, a flight that kept him

one step ahead of the agents of tyranny who sought to kill him.

Von Hildebrand abandoned the magnificent home of his father and his teaching position at the University of Munich. He went to Florence and lived at the home of his sister, his total possessions being 100 D. Mark. This was in 1933 when the Nazis succeeded in coming to power. Again von Hildebrand escaped just in time, for the Nazis had already condemned him to death for his public opposition to their racist *Weltanschauung*. At the end of 1933 von Hildebrand offered his services to Chancellor Dollfuss of Austria. He founded, under the patronage of the Chancellor, a weekly review, *Christliche Staendestaat*, an anti-Nazi publication dedicated to unmasking the falsities and cruelties of Nazism and Communism. Von Hildebrand wrote 80 articles for this weekly. He exposed Nazism and Communism as twin devils, the former a totalitarianism of the crooked cross dressed in brown, the latter a totalitarianism of the hammer and sickle dressed in red; the former a national, the latter an international Fascism.

Escape from the Nazis

In 1935 von Hildebrand became professor of philosophy at the University of Vienna. The Nazis attempted to prevent him from giving his courses. But the Minister of Education sent 48 police agents to protect him in his work. It was known that Chancellor Dollfuss was pleased with the work and writings of von Hildebrand. But Chancellor Dollfuss was assassinated in July, 1934. On February 12th, 1938 Hitler held a meeting with Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg at which he insisted that von Hildebrand's activity should be curbed. Four weeks after this meeting, the Anschluss took place; Austria was violently invaded and annexed by Nazi Germany. Nazi agents swiftly seized the apartment in which von Hildebrand lived. They knew the place and apartment perfectly. They went directly to a secret hiding place in the chimney to get their victim. But von Hildebrand had miraculously escaped. On March 11, 1938, thanks to his Swiss passport, possessed by an inheritance from his grandfather Bruno who had become an honorary citizen of Switzerland. As a refugee in Switzerland he lived off the charity of his friends and the

kindness of Swiss Catholics. In 1939, he was invited by Mgr Bruno de Solages to become professor at the University of Toulouse. But in 1940 the Gestapo was again on his heels. In Vienna the Prefect of Police, learning that the Nazi underground was planning to assassinate von Hildebrand, called and warned him to take precautions for his life. He was saved thanks to the devoted heroism of Edmond Michelet who furnished him with false papers, enabling him to flee France, pass through Spain and arrive in Portugal. Once in Portugal, he learned that the Rockefeller Foundation had been looking for him for several weeks. Jacques Maritain, his friend, had persuaded the Foundation to place von Hildebrand's name on a list of 100 persons they would work to rescue from the Nazis. Von Hildebrand had successfully covered his tracks out of France that no one knew where he was. He remained some time in Portugal and then left for the United States by way of Brazil. In New York he became professor of philosophy at Fordham University where he taught until 1960, the year of his retirement. He lost his first wife in 1957 and in 1959 he married Alicia Jourdain, his pupil and then his collaborator.

The Work of von Hildebrand

Von Hildebrand is an original, world-famous Christian thinker. His work is characterized by three major features: reverence for the human person, joy in the affirmation of the world of values and zeal in the exposition of the fecundity of the intimate inter-relationship between a living Christian faith and philosophical thought. He has produced a most impressive body of work since he started writing over sixty-five years ago. Never a mere scientific spectator, von Hildebrand is not interested in making philosophy an idea, a word or problem game. He never overwhelms his readers with *tour de force* formulas or obscure, pedantic expressions. He is an ardent seeker and joyful herald of truth wherever it can be discovered, in the freshness of things, the mystery of persons, the flash of divine revelation. Here, though he is, he is, nevertheless, rigorously insistent on precision and objectivity. Yet for all his objectivity, he never wraps himself in the mantle of neutralism. His work leaves

no doubt that truth and holiness are meant to be mankind's common treasure and that this philosopher works to make both come alive in his fellowmen. But though he presents truth in a direct and enthusiastic manner, von Hildebrand knows that the human person is so sacred that truth can never be forced upon him. In all his works von Hildebrand allows truth to speak for itself. He hopes his reader will freely work to achieve what he has presented.

Perhaps von Hildebrand's greatest, most original contributions to philosophy have been made in the field of values, natural and supernatural. He clearly explains that values can never be neutral. Indeed, their non-neutrality is an essential characteristic of values. For it belongs to the essence of values that they demand an appropriate response from persons. The necessity of adequate value-response is a truth brought forth by von Hildebrand which sheds completely new light on the profound relationship between human persons and the whole hierarchy of values, from God in whom all values are founded to the lowliest of creatures which radiate value in some degree. Von Hildebrand has explored in an inspiring way the truth that what makes man fully human, what makes him more than human, indeed divine, is his capacity to understand, to be influenced by and to respond in adequate ways to both naturally good and supernaturally holy values. No Catholic writer, as far as I know, has ever treated the sanctifying power of purity, marriage and consecrated virginity with the *Prise de Conscience* that von Hildebrand has displayed. He went beyond most in revealing the religious significance of natural values. And his friend Jacques Maritain marveled at von Hildebrand's rare ability to unveil the unearthly beauty of the supernatural values of the Catholic Faith. The influence of his work on purity, marriage and consecrated virginity can be discerned in the allocutions of Pope Pius XII (who had been his friend in Munich) as well as in the documents of Vatican II wherever they treat of these holy subjects. Though his ethical writings have been most influential, though his philosophical writings have pitilessly revealed the bankruptcy of that subjectivism and relativism dominant in modern philosophy, yet his sublimest work is surely his *Transformation in Christ: On the Fundamental Attitude of the Christian*. This book has been an inspiration to

thousands of Christians and a door opening out on Christ and His Church for thousands of others.

Division of his Works

As we have stated von Hildebrand left posterity an astonishing harvest of inspiring works; some 30 books, hundreds of articles, 2,800 pages of memoirs and thousands of pages of other documents just about ready for publication. His writings can be divided into three groups. First, his religious writings, such highly acclaimed books as: *Transformation in Christ*; *Liturgy and Personality*; *Marriage*; *Purity and Virginity* are known and read in many languages. Second, 6 volumes on Ethics, among which his classic *Christian Ethics*, 1 on Epistemology, 2 on Aesthetics, 1 on the Metaphysics of Community, 1 large volume on the Essence of Love to which he devoted 13 years of thought and research. Third, his works in defence of the Church and of orthodoxy. Among them we find: *The Trojan Horse*; *Humanae Vitae: A sign of Contradiction*; *Celibacy and the Crisis of Faith*; *The Devastated Vineyard*, and many others. His complete works have been published in part by Kohlhammer (Stuttgart) and Habbel in Germany. In 1970, Pope Paul VI bestowed upon him the Order of St. Sylvester in recognition of his work for and witness to truth.

Even after he retired from teaching in the classroom, von Hildebrand was in great demand as a lecturer. He continued to work enthusiastically in America and Europe. From the podium he lectured against the rise of neo-modernism, the desacralization of the liturgy, the revolt against sacred authority, the advance of militant atheism in the whole world. All these lectures appeared as articles or in published books. Every summer he travelled back and forth from America to Europe keeping his lines of communication humming with the wisdom of the best minds of both continents.

Yet during the last few years of such activity von Hildebrand was gravely ill with a weak heart. But his love for the Church and truth would not allow him to take a much needed and well earned rest. He was ever the *miles Christi*. Such was the charm of his person that he had friends everywhere, among peasants, among the high and the

mighty. And yet he was unaffectedly at home with peasants as with popes; all of the latter he had met from Benedict XV to Paul VI. In his last years he received the Sacrament of Extreme Unction five times. Even while in the Intensive Care Ward with other patients in serious condition, he managed to bring joy to his fellow sufferers. On hearing that one of the patients was Italian, he cheered the person by speaking his native tongue and filled the patient with joy by singing the *canzone*, *Dolce Napoli*. Von Hildebrand exuded joy as his predominant attitude. I remember driving with him and his wife to the airport, after they completed a lecture tour at Loyola University in New Orleans in 1965. Songs were sung by the von Hildebrands for the duration of the 13 miles. Both polyglots, they sang in many languages. His joy was infectious; it arose from his deep faith and boundless hope in Christ; it enlarged the souls of his listeners. For him to serve God was to reign and rejoice.

On January 8th, after having lost consciousness due to low blood pressure, he recovered and intoned the *Te Deum*. When he came to the words *non confundar in aeternum* von Hildebrand tried to sing the *Te Deum* of Bruckner, but his voice failed him. From September on he had spent 41 days in a clinic. During this time, Holy Mass was celebrated in his room and he answered the prayers with great fervour, as well as receiving Holy Communion with intense recollection. He recovered enough to return home on January 24th but, on January 26th, conscious to the end, as he accepted a glass of water, God called him to himself.

Von Hildebrand loved a special saying of Our Lord that resounded strongly in his soul. He felt these words were a call from Christ to him. "I have come to cast fire upon the earth, and what is my will, but that it be enkindled". To all who knew him well, von Hildebrand was Christ's kindling on earth. He fulfilled so well the salutary functions of divine fire. He enlightened, leading men to Christ by his teachings and writings. He purified, unmasking errors and evils that obscured truth and holiness. He glorified, revealing the beauty and holiness of Christ and His Church. His supreme goal was that men might achieve transformation in Christ. At the graveside it was said of him: "Dietrich, Christ's kindling, has now flared up into eternity."

This month's Current Comment is built round the splendid testimony of Nijole Sadunaite, a young Lithuanian Catholic woman, during the two days of her trial, June 16th and 17th, 1975. She is now halfway through a sentence of three years hard labour for her Faith, to be followed by three years of exile.

CURRENT COMMENT

Testament of Faith

THE EDITOR

On April 28th at 6 p.m. in the evening a group of young people of different Christian denominations handed in at the Soviet Embassy in London a petition, addressed to Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The petition called for the release of a young Catholic Lithuanian woman, Nijole Sadunaite by name, at the present time half-way through a sentence of three years hard labour in Siberia; to be followed by three years exile there.

Growing up under Persecution

Nijole Sadunaite was arrested by the K.G.B. in August, 1974 in her country, Lithuania, which has been under the Soviet heel since the close of World War II. She was sentenced in June, 1975 for her part in publishing the underground *Chronicles of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, to which reference has already been made by Mrs. Janice Broun in an article on the persecuted Lithuanian Catholic Church in *Christian Order* for February of last year. Nijole Sadunaite was born in 1938 in Lithuania. Her father was an instructor at the Institute of Agronomy at Dotnuva, a town in eastern Lithuania. Both of her parents were deeply religious people. Before the Soviet Union annexed Lithuania in 1940, some 80 per cent of its people were Catholics. Now

in that country, as in others under Soviet rule, this is considered to be a crime. Religious persecution is an everyday thing in Lithuania. Nijole grew up with it. In 1955 she completed high school at Anyksciai. By that time she had made a name for herself. Students who showed signs of religious belief were discriminated against in the school she attended, as in others. But Nijole never missed Mass on Sundays. During field trips, when the students were taken to see Catholic churches and view them as one might relics of a bygone era, Nijole would always genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament, no matter what her friends or teachers might think.

For five years she nursed her sick mother who died in 1970. Her father had died in 1963, so that she and her brother, John, are now the only living members of the family. After her mother's death, apart from her normal, every-day duties, Nijole nursed a sick priest for several years. Any person in need found a helping hand at Nijole's door: she was practising now a totally self-sacrificing Catholicism. She tried always to keep her own needs to the barest minimum so that she could help others the more; very often she gave away her own necessities of life if anyone who came to her seemed to be in need of them.

Arrest and Trial

Exactly when Nijole became involved with the clandestine *Chronicles of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* is not known. The underground paper began to be published secretly in her country in 1972 and eighteen issues have filtered through to the free world at irregular intervals since then. It was intended primarily to keep Lithuanian Catholics informed of the religious situation in their country by recording the details of all instances of religious persecution that came to be known to those working on the *Chronicle*. Its catalogue of facts, objectively set down, shows that the Soviets are conducting in Lithuania a massive campaign of religious persecution, using every means within their power to strike at those who refuse to give up their religious beliefs, not excluding school children in their earliest years.

On November 14th, 1973 a decision was made by the State Security Committee (the arm of the K.G.B. in Lithuania)

to carry out large-scale search operations in an endeavour to discover how and where the Chronicle was being published, so that the underground journal might be suppressed. Subsequently, several persons were arrested, tried and sentenced for their involvement with the paper. Nijole Sadunaite was one of them. Her trial lasted through the two days of June 16th and 17th, 1975. She had been arrested, as noted above, in August, 1974. During the two days of her trial, Nijole spoke the words of splendid magnificence which follow immediately. They were reported in Issue No. 17 of the *Chronicles of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, from which they found their way into a pamphlet well titled *No Greater Love*, which can be obtained from Lithuanian American Catholic Services, 64-09 56th Road, Maspeth, N.Y. 11378, USA. The testimony at her trial of this young Catholic woman of Lithuania is so wonderful that I am going to do what I do very rarely in my monthly Current Comment. I am going to quote excerpts from it at length, with the presumed permission of the Editors of *Immaculata*, Franciscan Marytown Press, 8000-39th Ave., Kenosha, WI. 53140, U.S.A. Here, then, are the excerpts from her testimony, spoken with total fearlessness before the enemies of her religion by Nijole Sadunaite at her trial:

Testimony of Nijole Sadunaite

"Truth is all powerful and cannot be conquered. Only deceit and falsehood need weapons and soldiers to prolong their contemptible rule, because they are powerless before the truth, and whatever power they are able to muster is only temporary anyway. It is well said that an arbitrary government digs its own grave. I know I am in the right and I am willing to sacrifice not only my freedom, but will joyfully give up even my life for the truth. There is no greater joy than to suffer for the truth and for the people. That is why I don't need a lawyer to defend me. I will speak for myself.

"I would like to tell you all that I love you as if you were my brothers and sisters and I would not hesitate to give my life for each one of you. Today you do not need my sacrifice, but you do need to hear the truth spoken to your faces. There is a saying that only he who loves has the right to reprimand. I make use of this right in addressing you.

"No evil act likes to look at its own horrible image, it hates its own reflection. That is why you hate everyone who tears off the veil of falsehood and hypocrisy behind which you are hiding. But the mirror does not lose its worth for all that! A thief takes a person's money, but you take away something even more valuable — a person's right to be faithful to his own convictions and to hand them down to his children.

"It was because you were afraid of Mindaugas Tanonis, who was engineering the reconstruction of public monuments and a technical studies candidate, that you took him to the psychiatric hospital on Vasara Street, hoping to 'cure' him of his convictions.

"The interrogators have never reprimanded doctors who have refused to allow their patients to have a priest at their deathbed, even if they and their relatives have requested one. Even criminals are granted a last request. But you dare to mock a person's most sacred beliefs at the most difficult moment of his life — the hour of his death. Like a gang of bandits you rob thousands of religious people of their moral and human rights. That is Communist morality and ethics! Who gave you atheists the right to tell pastors which priests they can invite to give retreats and missions to their parishioners? The decree 'On the Separation of the Church from the State and from Educational Institutions' declares that the State is to keep out of religious activities within a country. In Lithuania, the Church is not separated from the State; it is oppressed by the State.

"These and hundreds of other facts show clearly that you atheists are seeking to enslave people in a spiritual sense by forcing them to accept your opinions, and you justify any means to attain this end — lies, slander, terrorist tactics. And are you happy with your triumph? What have you triumphed over: Over the moral ruin of the country, over millions of unborn children whom you have killed, over people robbed of their human dignity, poisoned by fear and evil passions. This is what you have achieved, these are the fruits of your labours. Jesus Christ truthfully said: 'By their fruits you will know them'! Every day your crimes are bringing you closer to history's rubbish heap.

"This is the happiest day of my life. I am being tried for the Chronicles, which are a protest against the physical and spiritual tyranny to which my people are subjected. This

means that I am being tried because I love the people and want the truth. Loving people is the greatest love and fighting for their rights is the most beautiful love song. May it echo in everyone's heart and never die! I am privileged: my fate is an honourable one: not only have I fought for human rights and for justice, but I am being punished for doing so. My sentence is my triumph! I am sorry for only one thing — that I have not been able to do as much as I wish for my people. I will gladly lose my freedom for the freedom of others and I am willing to die so that others may live. Today I am standing on the side of Eternal Truth — Jesus Christ — and I recall his fourth beatitude: 'Blessed are they who thirst for justice, for they shall be satisfied'! How can I not be happy when Almighty God has shown that light triumphs over darkness and truth over lies and falsehood! In order to bring this about I am willing not only to be imprisoned, but also to die.

"So, let us love one another and we will be happy. Only he is unhappy who does not love. Yesterday you were surprised that I was in such good spirits at such a tragic hour of my life. This proves that my heart is burning with love for all people, since only love makes everything seem easy! We have to condemn evil as harshly as possible, but we must love the person, even if he is wrong. And we can learn to do this in the school of Jesus Christ, Who is our Way, our Truth and our Life. May your kingdom, Jesus, come into every soul."

The Cross and Ourselves

Nicole Sadunaite was sentenced to three years hard labour and three years in exile. When she heard her sentence she asked the court: "Why is the sentence so light"? Words fail me. I am close to tears. I think readers will find themselves, as I did, reading Nijole Sadunaite's testimony again and again. And I think they will find themselves, as I did, reflecting, as they read, on certain things. Above all, perhaps, they will be affected — and deeply and permanently affected — by the stark contrast between this young woman's simple and loving embrace of the Cross of Christ, and the fruitless endeavours of so many, especially priests and religious in the post-conciliar Church, to present

the Catholic Faith as something that can be lived without it; indeed, as they put it, to demythologise that Faith, which means, in fact, to desupernaturalise it, robbing it of Christ's Truth, which is of its essence, watering it down to suit what they think of as the modern mood; and handing down to the young they teach, not the Faith of their Fathers, whose following means the Cross, but pap of their own devising. For twelve years now we have been plagued by these pseudo renewalists within the Church, the mini-prophets and pop theologians who have set themselves up in their pride as a parallel and bogus magisterium within the Church. What they have offered the young is Christianity without the Cross, the Faith as a soft option; and the young have rejected it. That is why, in this country and elsewhere, they are trifling from the Faith as early as the Fifth Form at school; that is why the seminaries are empty; that is why the Religious Orders have no candidates. They don't deserve to have any. What is being offered the young today is neither the Faith nor true Religious Life, but a parody of both; anything but the Cross. No-one has the guts to offer them the one thing, at base, they long for. Instead, commissions are appointed to inquire into a disorder for which the commissioners' masters are, in fact, responsible. They have yet to realise that today those who long for the Bread of Life are being offered no more than a stone; their solution, when their offer is rejected, is to set up a committee to package the stone still more attractively. It has not yet entered their silly heads that the one thing they must do is throw away the stone.

The Faith is not Dead

Then one reads the glowing words of Nijole Sadunaite and one knows that the Faith is in no way dead; that it is here in the shining and strong purity of her testament; that so long as she and others like her follow Christ within the Church, the Faith can never die, even in the West. The day will come — indeed is on the way — when the word-spinners in our midst on this side of the Curtain will be forced to eat their words, when the bright shining of Nijole Sadunaite's example pierces through to the core of their seemingly empty hearts and restores to pride of place there the Cross of

Christ. In this alone is there salvation for the disintegrating Church in the West. For those who suffer in that Church at the hands of their own shepherds because they hold to the Faith of their Fathers; as well for as those, who suffer on the other side of the Curtain at Communist hands, let strength be found in Nijole Sadunaite's testament at her trial. It is through her sufferings and theirs that the Cross will be planted, once again, in the hearts of post-conciliar humanists within the Church. With that planting the victory of Christ's truth in His Church will be sure.

In illustration of the point with regard to vocations and religious life already made in this article, may I refer readers to a short article that follows immediately and illustrates this point perfectly. It relates to the American scene; but its application is I think church-wide throughout the world. This is the nonsense that is killing us. Read it for yourselves, please; then, say your prayers.

AND NOT ONLY IRELAND

"One of the most annoying, frustrating and indeed dangerous features of contemporary Irish life is the way in which a self-opinionated and self-appointed minority is striving to force its view on a passive Irish public, on a people who wish for nothing better than to continue to live decent Irish and Christian lives such as they have known, and to be afforded the socio-legal framework that will support them in doing so. Certainly the people whom I have met since returned to Limerick, whether rich or poor, have, generally speaking, no hankering after a secular or internationalist Ireland of a kind that would progressively forget the things of fatherland and of God" — Dr. Jeremiah Newman, Bishop of Limerick, as reported in the *Irish Independent*, 7/7/77.

This is the article readers were asked to look at after finishing this month's Current Comment. Reference is to the American scene. Application, with obvious variations, is worldwide. Specially recommended to vocation promoters. Compliments and thanks to the Wanderer.

Suffering for Point Omega

JOSEPH F. COLEMAN

VOCATION DAY is an annual experience in our all-boys school. Several priests, Brothers and seminarians from different Religious communities visit our classrooms. Their mission is to arouse interest in and to witness to the Religious vocation. For many students this will be the last time they receive information about the Religious life. Usually the religious begins by lecturing or giving an audio-visual presentation followed by a question and answer period.

One seminarian interests me. Modishly dressed he is dynamic, youthful and articulate. In our private meeting before school, these personal traits were evident. He is scheduled for my class of low-track students. These students, generally, are not college bound or academically oriented. However, they usually speak freely and robustly of their feelings and thoughts. Their response is more visceral than cortical. So, the interreaction of this young seminarian with my class of low trackers seemed the classic confrontation between the quick, polished boxer and the slow, flat-footed slugger. Ali versus Marciano. The Six Million Dollar Man takes on King Kong.

The seminarian opens the encounter with classic style. Using jokes, amusing anecdotes, and funny stories he breaks the ice, catches their attention and wins their loyalty. He slowly and skillfully shifts gears, moving from amusing tales,

to seminary life, to his own meaning of priesthood. He is good. He is smooth as an oil slick. The style is neat, attractive and clever, but something seems out of place. Certain of his brightly spoken words are wrestling with unfocussed feelings. Irritation grows especially when he speaks of the priesthood, the Church, and Jesus. Innocuous terms such as "personal fulfillment," cosmic service, "building the World" seem droll as reasons for being priest. Some revealing phrases such as "the Great Process," "Vanguard for Universal Growth," "the Flagship for Cosmic Progress" used to describe the Church and her historic role helped to bring my fumbling thoughts into focus. When Christ is described as the "soul of the world," "the great dynamo charging the Universe," and "the divine magnet pulling all things to Himself," the young seminarian has revealed his true avocation; a Teilhard-groupie. The young, articulate seminarian finishes with a charged call for all the "courageous men who want excitement and personal fulfillment to join with others in building up the earth for a better tomorrow!"

Question time is next on the agenda.

The kid wearing black and white platform shoes flashes his hand.

"Er — What kinda work do you do when you get to be a priest?"

"Oh, there are many different things I could do. I've been thinking, with my background in Psych and Poli-Sci I could do counselling at a clinic or maybe start an experimental group in the inner city and physically join our poor brothers and sisters in their struggle for equality. Or I . . ."

"Do you have a choice in all this?" interrupted the kid in the black and white platforms.

"Oh, you have a lot to say in it! More so today than ever before. Look, the Church is dying for priests — they'll give you almost anything you want just to keep you around. What I . . ."

"But, don't ya have to go where they say?"

"Not at all. Nowadays we can appeal if we don't like our placement. And the really new thing is 'Personal Choice Placement.' Oh the priesthood is different from before — much different. You can . . ."

"How 'bout religious things? Do ya still gotta do all that uff?"

"We still say the Liturgy and give the Eucharist. Then there is the Sacrament of Peace . . . I hope to do a lot of unselling. You know we still do all the sacrament stuff. But nowadays we do more than pray and bless bingo cards."

A few smiles and chuckles accompany the last comment.

A pause in the dialogue.

"Does anybody else have any questions?" asks the seminarian. Nobody else raises a hand. The young seminarian glances quickly at the wall clock. The kid with the fancy shoes continues in a matter-of-fact tone.

"Why did you wanta be a priest?"

"Like I said, for me, personally, it will be fulfilling. It's something I want to do. It's my way of making a very important contribution to my fellow earth-travellers."

"But why as a priest? Man, you can help others by having some other job. You don't haveta be a priest to help others. Do ya?"

"Either you're not picking up what I'm putting down or I'm not putting it down too good. I thought I explained that?"

"You did. But you have no special reason for wantin' ta be a priest."

"What? Now I don't know what you mean!" Exasperation swelling with each word.

"Ya know. Like, to save souls for Christ, to spread the faith, God called ya. Ya know, stuff like that. That's what I mean. Like the missionary guy that came here once. He said he became a priest because he believed that Christ is God and wanted to help others believe in Him. And he got beat up real bad over in the mission place 'cause he taught them about Christ and being a Catholic and stuff like that."

"Oh, we, . . . I believe in Jesus also and I . . ."

"Would ya get beat up for 'im?" demands the kid with black and white platform shoes.

"I don't see where that has any relationship to what I've been talking . . ."

"The missionary guy wouldn't spit on a cross so they cussed 'im up — real bad — you can see the scars on his face."

"I'm sure the missionary did what he felt was right for him to do in that situation and . . ."

"But shouldn't all you priests wanta die and get beat up for Christ?" implored the relentless student.

"Oh, that's a pretty heavy question — it would take a lot of time to explain exactly — we don't seem to have that time. Besides . . ." The bell sounds.

"Oops, there goes the bell. Thank you for your attention and remember try and do your bit for making it a better world. See you later."

The students file out in their usual irregular manner. The young seminarian's handkerchief flies across his pinched forehead and then pats his chalky lips. The seminary's Pliers remain locked in his briefcase. He smiles, shakes hands, says thanks, and moves to his next class.

The Way, the Truth, and the Light

Central to our Faith is the mystery of Jesus Christ Incarnate. Catechesis, as the *General Catechetical Directory* states, is always Christocentric. Basic to a Catholic life-style is a proper understanding of Jesus Christ. Indispensable to salvation is a firm grasp on Christ's identity because He is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." The infrastructure of the Catholic Church is rooted in the historic event of Jesus Christ's Revelations. Thus, if our conception of Jesus is distorted, the consequences are disastrous. Arianism, Nestorianism, Albigensianism, and Jansenism are examples of the villainy and dislocation stemming from a perversely distorted portrayal of Jesus.

Today Jesus is often depicted in the neo-modernist mold of "superstar", "omega point," and "Jesus Revolutionary." How often have the albums "Jesus Christ, Superstar" and "Godspell" been the substance of religion class for our Catholic students? How many Bob Dylan songs and Joe Baez records did the students hear at the "meaningful" liturgy where James Baldwin or Albert Camus excerpts were read for meditation? How often has the religion teacher used the religion book used Martin Luther King, Cesar Chavez, or Hurricane Carter as the symbols of Christ suffering in modern times? What is the accumulative perception and eventual conception of Jesus Christ a student receives from

these various forms of modernist input? Is it any wonder that religious life is unattractive to most young people? Sacrifice for superstar? Suffer for omega point? Serve the revolution?

Often the neo-modernist representation of Jesus is a melange of mystification and plain nonsense. As Jesus is popularised through falsification, less and less people know him. Knowing Jesus is the essential premise for a Christian life. Parents and teachers must agitate on behalf of Truth. They must proclaim the identity of Jesus to their children in the graphic words of St. Peter, "Thou art the Christ, Son of the Living God." Only with an honest account of Jesus Christ can our students hope to avoid a lifeless Faith and a faithless life.

THE NEW ICONOCLASTS

the golden vessels we have melted down;
the painted statues given to the axe;
the gorgeous vestments to the patient moth;
and the sonorous Latin to oblivion.
The gaudy and unnecessary sunsets still recur.
What we are working on that. Give us time.

Last month, John Eppstein considered the inroads made on the morale of the West by the Soviet policy of "peaceful coexistence", reinforced at Helsinki by "detente". Here, he considers the military and naval balance between the NATO Allies and the Warsaw Pact Communist Powers. Footnotes are appended.

NATO: Its Military and Political Situation

II: THE GROWING MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE USSR

JOHN EPPSTEIN

SINCE 1970 the balance of power, as measured in the statistics of strategic nuclear weapons and conventional armed forces⁽¹⁾, has tilted decisively in favour of the Soviet Union. The proportion of its GNP spent on defence — 11 to 13% over ten years as against 5.9% in the USA 4.9% in the UK — is an indication of this. Some salient figures relating to the present strength of the Atlantic Alliance and that of the Warsaw Pact are given below. Numbers do matter, but there are many other factors affecting the relative military capabilities of the two sides. There is all the difference, for instance, between a tightly controlled continental bloc (as the Warsaw Pact is, however great its overseas radiation) enjoying interior lines of communication, a single political system and standardized armaments, as against an association of fifteen States, with no central authority, whose co-operation depends upon the free play of public opinion and whose main source of reinforcement for the probable theatre of confrontation is 3,000 miles away.

One side is geared for an offensive, the other for a defensive role, a matter not merely of tactics and geography but of mentality. How far the conviction of a common cause worth dying for would galvanise the West into belligerent unity is questionable. The reliability under stress of war of the Russians' Eastern European Allies, with their own deep-rooted nationalisms, is another question. Naval comparisons are less complicated than those for the European theatre, for the rivalry, though not confined to the USSR and the USA, is substantially that of the two super-powers, as it is in strategic nuclear arms.

Strategic Nuclear Weapons

In this field a recent report of the Military Committee of NATO records an impressive increase of Soviet capabilities. "New intercontinental missiles with MIRV⁽²⁾ were deployed in 1975 and others are approaching initial deployment. By mid 1976 a significant part of the force may consist of these new missiles. Better accuracy, increased reliability, shortened reaction time and increased hardening of launching sites are upgrading the effectiveness of the strategic missile force". It goes on to record, among other things, the speeded-up production of missile-launching DELTA submarines and the long-range BACKFIRE bombers "suitable for either nuclear or conventional missions against land or sea targets in Europe and its periphery and, with in-flight refuelling, North America".

Land and Air Forces in Europe

The following figures refer only to the area of Central and Southern Europe with which the long-drawn out discussions at Vienna on Mutual Force Reductions are concerned. The disparity in numbers in North and Central Europe is large, if only "front line combat manpower" is counted — 910,000⁽³⁾ for the Warsaw Pact, 675,000 for NATO, including the Americans and the two French divisions in Germany. In Southern Europe, the 395,000 troops of Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania and Soviet units stationed in Hungary and Bessarabia are outnumbered by the Atlantic Allies, 540,000; but the Italian forces are widely

separated from the Greeks and the Turks, who are not anyway on speaking terms. It is the rapid increase of offensive weaponry on the Communist side which is more disturbing. The Soviets have built the new T.72 tanks at the rate of ten a week in the last two years, and the total of main battle tanks now in operational service in Central Europe is 19,000 for the Warsaw Pact as against NATO's 7,000 (23,000 as against 11,000 for the two sides as a whole). In conventional artillery the Pact has double the number of the Western Allies' guns, mortars and rocket launchers and 11,000 as against 6,800 combat aircraft. It is believed, however, that these inequalities are mitigated to some extent by the superior air-borne anti-tank weapons which NATO has developed, the better training of its pilots and the superiority of its electronic technology. Both sides, however, are currently introducing new missiles with more sophisticated lazer-guided delivery systems. In ten years Warsaw Pact air power has been transformed from a mainly defensive arm into a formidable offensive weapon. It is the Soviet tactical air forces which have recently been re-equipped with improved multi-role aircraft for this purpose, while defensive fighter aircraft have been relegated to their East European allies.

The Strategic Problem in Europe

General Yepischev, Chief of the Political Directorate of the Soviet Armed Forces, recently instructed officers to instil in their men the belief that the Western Powers are preparing to launch a third world war. At present Moscow's prevailing pursuit of its "peaceful coexistence policy" makes a sudden drive to the West into the Rhineland urban area an improbable scenario. But its whole order of battle assumes a quick initial advance of 60 km in the first 24 hours, and it would be foolish to ignore the fact that, with the Warsaw Pact's overwhelming preponderance of armour on the Central Front, a great deal of the Federal Republic's territory could be overrun before NATO's reserves could be mobilised and before its superiority in theatre nuclear weapons (now about 7,000 to the Russians' 3,500) could be thrown into the scales. For this would require a decision by the President of the United States. The nuclear warheads

operated by their Allies' troops (except for those in French hands) are under "double key" and, like those of American units, could be used only if ordered by him; and there would be great political reluctance among the allied governments to employ any nuclear arms, unless the other side had done so. Nor are only tactical nuclear weapons to be considered. It is now known that the Russians are arming their mobile medium-range rockets (SS20), aimed at targets in Western Europe, with MIRV's. It is such threats as these that justify the persistence of the Americans in the SALT negotiations, where their bargaining power makes a stalemate in strategic nuclear weapons at least feasible, and the continuance of the inconclusive discussions in Vienna on the mutual reduction of conventional armed forces in Central Europe, where the NATO team's reasonable proposal to achieve parity in the number of ground troops cannot be swept under the table. The most realistic guess of the Soviets' intentions is probably that both the ever increasing nuclear threat and the heavy superiority of conventional forces in Europe are planned with the object of enforcing compliance with their political programme, once their potential opponents have been sufficiently softened-up by *detente*, rather than risking a war. But the latter option is fully prepared. It is for a *blitzkrieg* that Soviet units in Eastern Europe are geared today; and the "warning time", on which NATO's strategy of "flexible response" is based, must now be reduced from weeks to days.

Expansion of the Soviet Fleet: the Southern Oceans

The massive expansion of the Russian fleet, as Admiral Sergei Gorshkov, its main architect, who has retired after twenty years as Commander-in-Chief, has often expounded, has three purposes: to establish the Soviet Union as a global power, as the British used to be and as the Americans are, with offensive as well as defensive capabilities in every ocean; to be able to operate against the lines of communication of its opponents; and to "support State interests", as in promoting political regimes sponsored by the USSR in any part of the world. There are no restrictions on the movements of Soviet warships in any international waters, nor, of course, are there on the ships of individual

Western countries, American, British, French and others; but owing to the short-sighted limitations of the North Atlantic Treaty, no joint operations by NATO could be conducted south of the Tropic of Cancer. Yet it is impossible to ignore the growing threat to maritime supply routes outside the North Atlantic Treaty area. Reporting to the Ministers of Defence of the Alliance in June 1976, Admiral of the Fleet Sir Peter Hill-Norton, then Chairman of the Military Committee, said:

"On average about a hundred merchant ships flying the flags of Western Nations transit the Cape of Good Hope each day bound for Europe or North America, with another hundred going the other way. Units of the Soviet Fleet are now deployed in strength in the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans, where they maintain a strong and continual presence. Their newly acquired bases on the East and West coasts of Africa provide them with the capability of mounting sea and air attacks on our supply routes, and at any time of their choosing they could effectively disrupt the essential supplies of oil and other raw materials on which not only our fighting capacity but our economy and indeed our very lives depend."

The fact that the highest military consortium in the Alliance makes such a serious assessment and that their political masters do nothing about it, illustrates a chronic weakness in this limited alliance of democratic countries, which certainly has no counterpart in the Warsaw Pact. The military and the politicians live in different worlds; and the latter is full of political and economic complexities, among which, it must nowadays be observed, there is an increasing trend in the European Left to avoid any unpleasantness with the USSR. The military authorities, who are of course the servants of their governments, do not underestimate these difficulties. "But", the Admiral continued, "we should all be failing in our responsibilities were we to permit these considerations to inhibit us from presenting the facts of the military situation, and this applies with particular force to my own position as spokesman for the Military Committee and for the major NATO commanders".

Relative Naval Strength

The distances to be covered from their main home ports by the principal Russian fleets, Northern (Murmansk), Baltic (Leningrad), Black Sea (Sevastopol) and Pacific (Vladivostok), have been relieved by the availability of an increasing number of bases outside Soviet territory (e.g. the Syrian ports in the Mediterranean; Berbera, Aden and the Mozambique harbours in the Indian Ocean; Conakry, the Angolan ports and Cuba in the Southern Atlantic). But it is the sheer number of modern sophisticated warships which gives them the freedom of action all over the world to which Admiral Hill-Norton refers. In ten years they have overtaken the American naval strength in many categories of ships though not in aircraft.

It is, of course, not only by the number of vessels that naval strength can be gauged but by their technical equipment and fire-power: the USSR has two aircraft-carriers (Kiev class) and two helicopter carriers against the 13 American aircraft carriers, including the 96,000 ton nuclear-powered Nimitz, to which, on the side of the Atlantic Alliance, two French and one British can be added.

• The following comparable figures of submarines (coastal submarines being excluded) in the summer of 1976 in the navies of the Warsaw Pact and of the Atlantic Alliance show a striking disparity.

Attack Submarines

	Nuclear	of which with SLBM ⁽⁴⁾		Diesel
USSR	84	78	845	147
Poland				6
Bulgaria				4
Total Warsaw Pact				241
USA	65	41	656	10
UK	9	4	64	19
France	3	3	48	20
Italy				8
Netherlands				6
Portugal				3
Turkey				14
Total Atlantic Alliance				147

The United States has 176 and the USSR 241 "Major Combat Surface Ships" in commission: The Warsaw Pact allies have none to speak of, but of the Atlantic allies, Britain has 76, Canada 19, France 52, Germany 17, Greece 13, Italy 21, Netherlands 18, Norway 5, Portugal 7, Turkey 14. Thus, in this classification, which includes carriers, cruisers, destroyers and frigates, the Atlantic Allies have a substantial superiority with 418 vessels, though many of these are normally concerned with the defence of their own countries and do not form part of an integrated force. The Soviet fleets have the advantage for intelligence purposes of the close co-operation of 3,400 fishing trawlers. Even more important, the whole of its great merchant navy receives its orders from the same naval headquarters in Russia.

CONCLUSIONS

The following rough conclusions therefore can be reached about the present numerical balance of armaments:

(a) In strategic nuclear weapons there is, roughly, a stalemate. The USSR (as at November, 1976) has a superiority in Equivalent Megatonnage which could be delivered in intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles of 1,805 over the USA, but the latter has superiority if the maximum nuclear loads which bombers could deliver at intercontinental range are counted in. The USA also has at present the advantage in low-flying, long-range cruise missiles.

(b) In conventional land and air armaments in the Central European theatre the Warsaw Pact outweighs NATO heavily in manpower, tanks, tactical aircraft and artillery, but not in tactical battlefield nuclear weapons.

(c) In naval armaments the Soviet Union has nearly 100 more attack submarines than the combined navies of the Atlantic Alliance and its superiority is increasing through rapid shipbuilding.

(d) The Atlantic Allies have over 200 more major combat surface warships than the Warsaw Pact and over 2,000 more "afloat aircraft"⁽⁵⁾.

There are, of course, many other factors to take into account, beginning with the morale of the people and their leaders. It is with this crucial matter that last month's article

was concerned. The military core of the Alliance is sound, as anyone who visits the BAOR or any of NATO's Command headquarters can see. It is good that public opinion should be aroused by what Admiral Hill-Norton calls "the indisputable evidence that we are faced with a relentless determination on the other side to achieve military superiority". But in his same farewell statement ⁽⁶⁾, he said: "Within the necessary limitations of a free and democratic association of 15 nations, NATO works astonishingly effectively", and insisted that such "doom-watch scenarios" as certain United States Senators and others have been publishing fail to do justice to the improvements in the Alliance effected in the last three years. Despite the economic crisis, the budgetary contributions both of the USA and its European allies were in fact higher in 1976 than in 1975, and some very effective modernisation programmes of land, naval and air armaments have been carried out.

It is obviously urgent to build up NATO's conventional forces in Europe; but it is not so much to military facts and figures that we must look for the means of holding and thwarting the dynamism of Communist Russia, as to the will of our peoples. And today it is the poverty of moral principle and national spirit in this and other Western countries which is the greatest asset of NATO's relentless opponent.

- (1) The statistics in this article, unless otherwise stated, are taken from *The Military Balance 1975-1976*, published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- (2) Multiple independently targetted re-entry vehicles. The forecasts made in this report have now been realized.
- (3) IISS Statistics. Figures issued for the Vienna negotiations as at 15 January 1976, give, however, other totals. N.W. Central Europe, Warsaw Pact 895,000. NATO 625,000. S. Europe Warsaw Pact 345,000. NATO 575,000. The comparison in Divisional Equivalents in Europe between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is as follows: NATO 67 in place; reinforcements 4; total 71. W.P. 90 in place; reinforcements 90; total 180.
- (4) Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles.
- (5) According to *United States/Soviet Military Balance*, a study by the Library of Congress USGPO Washington DC, the USSR had, in 1975, 480 'naval bombers', the USA none. On the other hand, the USA had 450 ASW patrol aircraft to the Russians' 360, and 2,132 "afloat aircraft" to the Russians' 53.
- (6) On relinquishing the Chairmanship of the Military Committee, April 14, 1977.

The parallel between the reforms carried out in this country in the sixteenth century and those taking place today is close and startling. An outline is given here. The reader is left to draw his own conclusions.

Then and Now

Cranmer

Rides Again

REV. A. F. CHADWICK

IN 1928, Messrs. Sheed and Ward published *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* by Cardinal Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, in the revised edition. Today, we can see history repeating itself. A certain parallel is to be found between the action of the reformers of the 16th century and that of our own innovators. Their actions have much in common, although times have changed in some ways. The following words apply just as well to our modern reformers as to the reformers of long ago, about whom they were written: "The bulk of the innovators were but an unruly mob, for whom destruction and freedom from restraint have ever an attraction". (page 40) It is interesting to note that the same demands were then made for obedience at any price. Thus Bishop Heath of Worcester declared that if the new Orfinal were imposed, "he would not disobey". (52) But after the Order in Council for the removal of altars, Bishop Day of Chichester, a stouter soul, told Somerset "he could not conform his conscience to do what he was by the said letters commanded". The bishop was promptly told "to do his duty and in such things to make no conscience". (232)

Many who once exhibited a great love for and devotion to the old Roman Mass now stand on their heads and manifest

an equal hatred for the Mass of their ordination. The same thing happened long ago. "Dr. Smith who had written in defence of the Mass during the reign of Henry VIII later recanted at Saint Pauls, declaring his former books erroneous and heretical". (24).

Whilst on the subject of books, it is interesting to notice that authors of works of traditional theology found it as hard then as they do now to find a publisher. "Hardly a book or a pamphlet written in support of the ancient doctrines appears to have issued from the English press". Treatises by Bishop Gardiner and Bishop Tunstall on behalf of the Sacraments had to be printed abroad, or secretly. (87) Whereas the country was flooded, as it is now, with cheap booklets, which were either original compositions or translations of works written by foreign reformers. (87)

"Forward-looking clerics" today who cast out statues and images of the saints long venerated by their people are in fact rather backward-looking. In the reign of Edward VI, the Bishop of Winchester was imprisoned for refusing to give his approval to the doing away with images. (34) "All the images in every parish church in London were pulled down and broken by order of the king's Visitors". (41) It doesn't take such threats today!

Constant demands are being made today for a wider use of the practice of giving Holy Communion under both kinds. Some priests even want to see this made obligatory. Scripture is quoted, just as the reformers of old quoted scripture as their warrant, although their real desire was to break with the Mass as a sacrifice in favour of the Supper. This may very well be in the mind of our modern innovators. One of the very first of Cranmer's innovations occurred in November, 1547, when a Bill was read providing for the administration of Holy Communion under both kinds. (42) The adoption of Communion under both kinds afforded the innovators the great advantage of a break with the ancient Missal". (51)

Reformers and innovators are wise and astute. We have witnessed a gradual transformation of the old Roman rite into the Novus Ordo Missae. Step by step, bit by bit, it happened. It was the same in the 16th century. In order to discover how far it was wise to go, a series of questions was submitted to the bishops to see if it would be possible to

sweep away the Mass altogether, or prudent to temporise yet awhile. So the bishops were asked; What do you mean by the Mass? What is the Mass for, for sacrifice or for communion? Shall we do away with the Mass offered for the living and the dead, as distinct from communion? Shall the Mass be in English? (57)

There was a time, some years ago, when we thought we would be allowed to retain the old Roman Mass, with some few minor alterations. We were very foolish to be so taken in, as some of our ancestors were deceived by the method adopted by Cranmer. "It seems certain that at this point Cranmer did not feel himself in a position to press upon the English Church changes in the liturgy beyond the point to which the more conservative among the bishops were prepared to go". (60) Thus the new Order of Communion left the Mass still intact in Latin. "It provided only for Communion under both kinds". (62) "But the rite was only to stand until other orders be provided". (67)

Then, as now, experiments were the order of the day. "The King is advertised that certain private curates . . . do rashly attempt . . . not merely to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonies, but themselves bringeth in new orders everyone in the church according to their phantasies". (68)

And, as might have been expected, the effect upon the faithful was very much the same as it is now. "The abolition of these observances among a people who had never been accustomed to any but Catholic rites was nothing less than a rude uprooting of old habits and associations connected with all that was most sacred in their lives". (71). Naturally enough, a certain amount of propaganda was necessary before the vernacular became acceptable. "The substitution of English for Latin in all services, far from affording any gratification to the peoples' religious feelings, was a measure to which they have had to be reconciled". (205)

Most people have at least heard about the Windsor Agreed Statement on the Eucharist. It may have occurred to some to wonder why the International Commission met at Windsor. Long ago, another important meeting took place at Windsor. "But when a great number of such learned men of both sorts were gathered together at Windsor, for the reformation of the service of the Church, it was agreed by

oth, without controversy, that the service of the Church ought to be in the mother tongue". (104) Interesting that the commissioners of today chose Cranmer's meeting place for their discussion on the Eucharist.

Nowadays, it is considered very meaningful to discard the chasuble, at least, when saying Mass in homes or in school class-rooms. The reformers knew very well that the chasuble is the priestly vestment par excellence, and therefore made the wearing of it optional. Later, they abolished its use altogether. "By the fourth rubric allowing the choice of vestment or cope, the use of the chasuble (essentially a sacrificial vesture of the priesthood) at the service 'commonly called the Mass' is made optional". (155)

And, just as in the new Roman Missal, the rubrics were vague and few and far between in the Prayer Book. "There is however nothing in the enacting clauses (of the Act of Uniformity) forbidding the priest to use the old ceremonial, whilst the rubrics are so scanty that he is necessarily left to his own interpretation as to what he should do or not do". (156)

The ambiguous offertory prayers of the new Mass have been much criticized, and rightly so, because these prayers no longer speak clearly of a sacrifice for the living and the dead. Cranmer likewise destroyed the offertory. "It will therefore appear", wrote Gasquet and Bishop, "that the ancient ritual oblation with the whole of which the idea of sacrifice was so intimately associated, was swept away". (160)

Not only did Cranmer sweep away the ritual oblation. He proceeded to alter the words of institution, by adding "which is given to you" and by omitting the phrase "mystery of faith". The excuse was a return to the scriptural account. The intended effect was to reduce the consecration to a narration of what had happened long ago. Cranmer had nearly lost belief long ago in the Catholic teaching about the Mass. (c.f. pages 58 and 129.) Our modern innovators, be it noted, have seen fit to add the phrase "which is given up for you" to the consecration of the bread; and to remove the words "mystery of faith" from the consecration of the wine, thus making the phrase refer, not to transubstantiation, but to some other mystery, e.g. to the second coming of Christ.

The removal of the prayer for the sanctification of the

gifts on the altar is also highly significant. Bishop Gardiner presumed this prayer to be proof of the doctrine of transubstantiation. (260) It is strange, to say no more, that this prayer to the Holy Ghost should be removed just at a time when we are being asked to believe that the reform has taken place under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Over the last few years, up and down the country, many old and beautiful altars have been dismantled, and replaced by wooden constructions standing in front of the old, permanent altar — and this without any regard for the donors of such altars. Well, it has all happened once before. "The Visitors commanded that six altars in Jesus College Cambridge, be pulled down." (213) "All the altars in every parish church in London were taken away and a table made in the choir for the reception of the Communion". (22) Cranmer sent to the bishops a series of reasons why "the Lord's board should be rather after the form of a table than of an altar". (231) This was because he wanted to teach that it was the Lord's Supper, the Communion, which was being celebrated, not the sacrifice of the Mass. Recently, an American Dominican Friar described on the Radio how he had been given an appointment to serve in Coventry Cathedral, and how he had been assigned a chapel there where he had celebrated the Communion for a number of Catholics. Students in the seminary used to look forward to the reception of Minor Orders, and then the subdiaconate — steps towards the priesthood which helped to relieve the tedium of the lecture hall. Now, they are no more. We have copied the old reformers. One of the articles presented for his signature to Bishop Gardiner when in prison stated that "the subdiaconate and the Minor Orders were rightly abolished". (249)

Progressive priests who use loaves of Hovis in place of unleavened bread are not quite so progressive as they fondly imagine. One of the rubrics of the second Prayer Book directed that "ordinary bread be used in place of the unleavened bread". (264)

And what about those tabernacles removed from their place on the altar? It has all been done before. "Catholic people witnessed the Blessed Sacrament pulled away from its place over the altar, and they were told by those who

posed the new service that it was not to be worshipped, as was wont to be". (218)

There is no doubt about what the reformers thought about the Mass. It was no sacrifice. "They might differ in their views about the Sacrament but they were all united in condemning the old teaching about the Mass, and in their hatred of the Canon of the missal". (96) The proposal, at the first meeting of Convocation in 1547, to abrogate all the canons against the marriage of priests may well have been connected with the loss of belief in a sacrificing priesthood. And such a loss of belief may well lie behind the present agitation in some countries to abolish the celibacy of the clergy as a law.

Gasquet and Bishop mention the antiquity of the Roman Canon, that it has remained practically unchanged to the present day. "This fact, that it had so remained unaltered during 13 centuries is the most speaking witness of the veneration with which it has always been regarded and of the scruple which has ever been felt at touching so sacred a heritage, coming to us from unknown antiquity". (162) Neither Cranmer in his day nor his present imitators felt the same scruple.

Why did the Catholics of Edward's reign object to the reformed liturgy? Why do so many Catholics in our day object as strongly to their new service? "A Catholic who sees in the living liturgy of the Roman Church the essential forms which remain still what they were 1,200 years, perhaps nearly 1,400 years ago, cannot but feel a personal love for those sacred rites which come to him with all the authority of centuries. Any rude handling of such forms must cause deep pain to those who know and use them. For they come to them from God, through Christ and through the Church. But they would not have such attraction were they not also sanctified by the piety of so many generations who have prayed in the same words and found in them steadiness in joy, and consolation in sorrow." (149)

And who can deny that the sacred rites have once again suffered a rude handling?

From time to time we all play games — if I were Prime Minister or Bishop of this or Cardinal of that. In this article, Father Bryan Houghton tells what he would do were he Bishop of an English diocese by way of a first beginning at restoring so much that has been lost. The tone is light; the intention serious; the substance of his article most positive.

To Toe or Draw the Line?

BY REV. BRYAN HOUGHTON

IT must have been about four or five years ago. I had been lunching with my then bishop Charles Grant of Northampton. The food was good, the conversation gay. We adjourned for coffee to the Chancellor's office. Suddenly His Lordship turned on me: "It is a very well for you to criticise, Bryan; but what would you do in my position?" The question is perfectly fair although too complex to answer over a cup of coffee. However, I shall answer it now, some four and a half years later. To do so, I shall imagine myself to be a perfectly normal and honourable English bishop who wakes up one morning to discover that he has had enough. He vanishes to a convent for a few days where he knows he will be undisturbed and the good Sisters will provide him with a typewriter and a duplicator. This is the result: —

+ + + + +

Right Reverend, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers,
Since you are the priests of my diocese, it is in the first place to you that I owe some explanation for my actions and an indication of my intentions. It is you who will suffer or gain because of them.

I have not consulted my colleagues in the episcopate nor

the Apostolic Delegate. I shall send them by the present post a copy of this letter in order that they should be duly informed. I am conscious that I am presenting both them and you with a *fait accompli*. Yes; but were I to act otherwise nothing would be accomplished at all. I prefer to have the arguments after the deed is done rather than before the deed is never done.

For some fifteen years now, Holy Church has been in a state of revolution. I need not tell you what harvest it has reaped: your own parochial returns are more eloquent than anything I can write. Throughout this period of turmoil you have shown wonderful obedience; you have remained at your post in near-heroic circumstances; you have continued to act as pastors to your flocks. At all events, the responsibility for the chaos and loss of souls is not yours but mine. You can find a ready excuse for whatever follies you may have committed; I have none.

Very well, since it is I who am responsible before God, I have decided that in the diocese which He has committed to my care the revolutionary process shall go no further. Indeed, by His grace and with your help, I hope to rebuild what has been so wantonly destroyed. The revolution has two distinct facets: its method and its content. I wish to deal first with the former.

The most striking feature of its method is that it proceeds by inserting the thin ends of countless wedges. It has never revealed its aim. None of us can picture the sort of Church it has in mind. Its ultimate objective has been hidden all along and, indeed, still is. Is the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Catholic priesthood to be abolished? Impossible! you may say, but you cannot be certain. Is infant Baptism, auricular confession and the whole sacramental system to disappear? Perhaps you know; I don't. And what of "The One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church"? It has already become "a pluralist, permissive, oecumenical and evolutionary ecclesial group". And then what? A World Religion? You do not know any more than I. How many of you realized, when you stopped joining thumb and index finger after the consecration, that you would be placing the Blessed Sacrament into the hands of the laity and that the laity would be distributing Holy Communion? And we know perfectly well that the process is not ended. I could fill a page with

practices already in operation on the Continent and which will cross the Channel with the ease of migratory birds. Here are a few: the Sunday obligation changed from attendance at Mass to attendance at the Community Gathering; Eucharistic Meetings under lay chairmen with or without pre-consecrated hosts; inter-communion with non-Catholics (as is already allowed at Nuptial Masses); concelebration (i.e. when both parties consecrate both species) with non-Catholic Ministers; inter-celebration with non-Catholics (i.e. when the Catholic consecrates one species and the non-Catholic consecrates the other); shared tabernacles in shared churches; married priests; temporary priests—which we already have in view of the ease with which we can be laicized; etc. . . . To date I have not heard of any lady-priests, but can any of you guarantee that I shall not be asked to ordain one? No matter what absurdity you think up, someone has already done it and soon under obedience you will be required to do it yourself.

The revolution is not concerned with doctrines but with "orientations", with our "outlook", just like a political party. Of old, we Catholics were a motley gang wonderfully unified internally, at the very core of our being, by a common Faith. We are still a motley gang but are expected to be unified by something extrinsic, by our outlook. All that is required of us is to tow the line. But towing the line is a fruitless task if one does not know where one is going. Sooner or later one will have to draw the line instead; so it had better be done now in case it never is.

That is the basic trouble with the revolution: it hides its end, but is adamant in its means.

Very well, my dear Fathers, I intend to do exactly the opposite. I wish to make my aim perfectly clear: it is to restore the Church very much as she was at the death of Pope Pius XII. This I know, of course, to be impossible in practice. All revolutions leave indelible scars even after the wounds have healed. Besides, some of the specific reforms may prove to have been beneficial, others innocuous; and time may mend still more far more effectively than could I. It is during the slow process of restoration that we shall best be able to appreciate what should be retained and what discarded. My aim, however, is clear and I shall not deceive you with edges of wedges.

A natural corollary of the "wedge" process is to have undermined the credibility of the clergy in general and of us bishops in particular. It is perfectly evident that we bishops have prescribed today what we proscribed yesterday and shall contradict tomorrow. It is so inevitable an element of the revolutionary process that I am doing it now in trying to get clear of the system! You have been expected to clap the latest innovation while your hands were still sore from clapping the one before. Your presbyteries are bulging with literature which was obsolete before it was delivered. We have been worse than weather-cocks. We have eaten our words so often that the laity think twice before swallowing what we utter. Was this what the revolution wanted, to undermine the credibility of the clergy? If so, it has succeeded beyond its wildest dreams.

Very well, my dear Fathers, I intend to reverse the process. After the honour of God, notably in the Blessed Sacrament, my first concern will be to save your faces, to restore your credibility. The point is that the honour of God is literally in your hands, since you are the Ministers of the Mass. Clearly, to ask you to swivel round again like the weather-cocks which we have been, to clap and cheer as we have done over the past fifteen years, to tow the new line as we have towed the old will not restore your credibility. What will? It is by the reality of your Faith that you become credible. Not only are your parishioners not half-wits but often the more simple the more sensitive to their priests' sincerity.

What does this mean in practice? It means, in opposition to the revolutionary process, that I shall be far less concerned with your acts than with your Faith, far more with the validity of your ministrations than their liceity. Mind you, one of the most tragic victims of the revolution has been the Rule of Law, which it has substituted with the Anarchy of Whim. However, I am quite conscious that the Rule of Law will not be restored over-night. In the meantime I wish to leave you (always within the bounds of unquestionable validity) whatever liberty you can justify on the grounds that you would otherwise lose your credibility.

This brings me to a third characteristic of the revolution: it was wantonly unkind. Just think for a moment of the *Notificatio* of June 14th, 1971, which provided that the Im-

memorial Mass could only be said by sick and aged clergy with nobody present. These old priests had borne the burden of the day and the heat thereof. We all owe them an unrepayable debt of gratitude. What was their crime? It was their credibility: their love for the Mass impinged into the world of reality. But that is not where lay the greatest cruelty. This lay in the fact that no provision whatsoever was made for the laity who committed the same crime. They cannot say Mass themselves, nor indeed self-administer Extreme Unction and Viaticum no matter how sick and old. How easy it would have been to have allowed the Immemorial Rites in Old Folk's Homes until, say, 1990! But no, the laity fail to figure in the pastoral preoccupations of the revolution.

It is true that in this diocese I did not go out of my way to persecute the few priests who clung to the old Mass. I also permitted the use of the English Indult whenever I was asked. But this scarcely exonerates me from being party to the basic cruelty of the revolution. These people had been robbed of an inalienable right. Did I do anything to defend them? Nothing! In fact, in my particular case the cruelty was aggravated by hypocrisy, since I said the old Mass whenever I could in my private chapel.

This last phenomenon is worth examining. I doubt if I am endowed with more built-in hypocrisy than my neighbour. How comes it then that I should prohibit publicly what I practiced privately? It is a result of the National Conference of Bishops: we had surrendered the personal rule of our dioceses to an impersonal committee. It is what that distinguished thinker, Fr. Houghton, would cite as a striking example of the cleavage between the "collective" and the "individual" will. Anyway, you see the result. It is not edifying. It must stop.

Very well, my dear Fathers, I shall again reverse the process. I shall assume direct responsibility for the diocese which God has committed to my care. Of this responsibility the present letter is the first expression. Moreover, I shall not deal with the "young and healthy" as the revolution dealt with the "old and sick". A generation has grown up which never knew the pre-revolutionary Church. Priests have been ordained in and for the New Rite — and there is a contractual element here which should not be overlooked.

Their divine vocation was, of course, to the Perennial Church but their human response can scarcely fail to have been coloured by their revolutionary formation with its outlook and ideals. They too have rights. I must be careful not to infringe on them, especially when I think them wrong.

Incidentally, at the moment we only have five clerical students for the diocese. At an early date I shall do my best to ensure that they receive the least inadequate formation available for their high calling.

That, my dear Fathers, will give you some idea as to what I find distasteful in the revolution and shall consequently endeavour to reverse.

+ + + + +

I now come to the content of the revolution. It has affected every aspect of Catholic life down to the most ridiculous details. In due course I shall have to cover the lot. In the present letter I shall only deal with one small field, and that by no means exhaustively.

The first victim of the revolution, both in time and in importance, was the Mass. How shall I set about restoring it?

1. Concerning the Immemorial Mass, usually called the "Tridentine".

- a) As from today it may licitly be celebrated by all priests of this diocese.
- b) It should be said in Latin and using the old calendar; St. Joseph should be included in the 1st Communicantes; the doxology "*Per ipsum et cum ipso . . .*" should be said alone or sung, but not the *Libera nos . . .*; the Last Gospel may be said at the altar, as a recessional or as thanksgiving in the sacristy.
- c) In parishes with three or more Masses on Sundays and Holydays, one of them (and preferably the High Mass or *Missa Cantata*) should be in the Immemorial Rite.
- d) I also hope that priests in such parishes who feel unable to celebrate the Immemorial Mass (which is perfectly understandable in those ordained since 1969) will arrange for an exchange of altars with a priest who is able and willing.

2. Concerning Eucharistic Forms promulgated after 1970,

(1) See "The Talking Church" in June 1975 number of *Christian Order*.

i.e. those for children, reconciliations and their derivatives. These are forbidden in this diocese, along with all personal innovations.

3. The *Novus Ordo*, promulgated in April 1969 and enforced in England and Wales on the 1st Sunday of Lent, 1970.

- a) This remains licit on the authority of the Holy See. It is intended for the vernacular and should not normally be celebrated in Latin. The new calendar should be used. I wish, however, to draw your attention to the adaptations which I judge suitable for this diocese at this juncture.
- b) The Ministry of the Word, Pre-Mass or Mass of Catechumens. This should be said facing the people from the ambo as you say it now.
- c) The Bidding Prayers. These have led to some strange abuses. Items suggested by the mass-media are unlikely to be news to God. I am, however, loath to suppress them at present. I suggest that they take the form of three Hail Marys for our Holy Father the Pope and the welfare of the Church. If the Credo is said, they would be better placed before than after it.
- d) The Offertory. This is quite inadequate in the New Ordo and should be replaced by the prayers in the Tridentine Missal, of which I enclose an approved translation. At a vernacular Mass they should be said aloud and in English.

I attach particular importance to the prayers at the Offertory. Why? Firstly, because the Mass is not only the making of the Blessed Sacrament by transubstantiation; it is also a sacrifice by the changing of the human oblation of bread and wine into the divine oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Offertory is precisely the human oblation which is to undergo "trans-sacrification". Secondly, because the new Preces or Canons (especially Prex II) are sufficiently ambiguous to demand a formulation of the celebrant's intention. This intention is admirably expressed in the prayers of the Offertory.

That you all have the intention "to do what the Church does", I have not the slightest doubt. But in the turmoil of revolution, what goes without saying is much better said.

- e) The Preces or Canons. All four are licit although I should have thought Prex II so obviously unworthy as to become obsolete.
- f) The Consecration. i. At this point we are not speaking in our own names but in persona Christi. This momentous fact should be clearly indicated by speaking the words in a low voice and in Latin. ii. The words "*mysterium fidei*" should be replaced in the consecration of the chalice.
- g) The Acclamations. Those at present in use seem strangely inept. As an alternative I suggest that the priest, turning to the people and indicating the Blessed Sacrament, should say: "Behold the Mystery of Faith", and the people answer: "Thou art my Lord and my God".
- h) Communion during Mass. Those physically able should receive Holy Communion kneeling. The Blessed Sacrament is to be placed directly on the tongue and not in the hand. Holy Communion is to be given only by priests and deacons.
- i) After Communion, the priest shall purify the chalice and his fingers with the appropriate prayers, aloud and in English, from the old Missal. The two minutes silence is unnecessary: it makes us appear to adore the Absence of our Redeemer rather than the True Presence.

4. A Hybrid Mass. Is such to be allowed in the diocese? Yes. I see no reason why the Pre-Mass, up to and excluding the Offertory, should not be said in alb and stole according to the New Ordo and calendar, facing the people from the ambo. The celebrant would then ascend the altar, don the chasuble and celebrate the Mass itself with his back to the people and in Latin, according to the Immemorial Rite, up to and including his own Communion. For the Communion of the Faithful he could revert to the vernacular and, after purifying chalice and fingers, end the Mass according to the New Ordo.

In fact, I rather hope that this form of celebration will be fairly widely adopted. It has the merit of preserving the integrity of the Immemorial Mass while allowing for a positive contribution from the New Ordo. Besides, it may help to save our faces. We shall not directly and too ob-

viously be denying what we have proclaimed. We shall rather be replacing in the new setting that pearl of great price which we had lost.

Fortunately in this diocese tabernacles have not been displaced and, even if the altar has been moved forward, it is still possible in most cases to say Mass back to the people. The exceptions are known to me and can be dealt with privately.

+ + + + +

There, my dear Fathers, that for the moment is probably as much as you will care to read, although, concerning the Mass alone, there are a dozen problems on which I have not touched. They can be solved as we go along.

You may well ask: what of all this is obligatory and what not? I only impose one obligation, that contained in paragraph (h) of the section on the Novus Ordo, to wit: "Those physically able should receive Holy Communion kneeling. The Blessed Sacrament is to be placed directly on the tongue and not in the hand. Holy Communion is to be given only by priests and deacons." This will come into effect on Sunday . . . All the rest is merely permissive; it is my wish and hope. Indeed, I have no intention of imposing any other obligation upon you until I have consulted the Chapter. Moreover, before I do so, I shall first want to feel your reaction, not by what you say but by what you do. This will take time. It is what you do which I hope eventually to make obligatory.

Am I making confusion worse confounded? Apparently, perhaps. A builder's yard often looks a mess. But you have an idea of my overall plan and I shall send you detailed drawings in due course. It will be up to you to build as best you can. Order will emerge as the building proceeds.

I have one further observation to make. The revolution has not just affected "this and that"; it has affected everything. It has not touched the dogmas of the Holy Faith but has attacked our attitude to all of them. It has undermined our piety; that is the basic tragedy. To restore the Church will not only require clarity in our aim and charity in our means but above all piety in our persons. Granted this, God will rebuild it for us.

In this article, Henry Edwards has wise things to say on authority and the revolt against it, which is really a craving and a striving for a new authority; on liberalism and democracy and the tyranny both can exercise; on the Church, the world and the pride of life.

Our Acceptance of Authority

HENRY EDWARDS

THE Englishman who knows his Chesterton better than I do will know just where to find Chesterton's story of a revolution which caused the king of a certain country to abdicate in order that a fairly moderate, bourgeois democracy, rather like the one from which we suffer, take the place of the monarchy — a real monarchy, I mean. Meanwhile a mysterious gentleman sits in a cafe smoking a cigar and drinking black coffee, the while he reads all the newspapers. Later on a somewhat more radical revolution takes place, installing a regime similar to Kerensky's in Russia. The mysterious gentleman is to be found doing much the same in the cafe. At length a "Peoples' Republic" is founded after yet another revolution; and still the mysterious gentleman continues smoking his cigar and drinking coffee and reading the newspapers. Then comes the day when the mysterious gentleman is summoned by the last rebels who oust the Peoples' Republic so that he may re-ascend the throne.

Social and anti-Social Replace Truth and Error

That story, written by a man who was perhaps more of a republican than a royalist but who would have seen the case for royalism as put by Bolingbroke in his *Patriot King*, often comes to my mind when I hear some discussion upon authority. I see therein that some sort of authority is ap-

parently necessary. Nowadays it seems to most people outside the iron and bamboo curtains that the right type of authority is to be found through liberal democracy, though to such an extreme advocate of personal freedom as Nicholas Berdyaev, such an authority was wrong because it made law the consequence of majorities, while law is, at its best, a reflection of what conforms with reality. Truth itself, an objective rather than a subjective matter. Indeed, we are here facing that subtly dangerous habit of mind which has well enough been called "liberalism", a habit which sets aside notions of truth and error, justice and injustice and proposes for us the concepts of social or anti-social behaviour, which my grandfathers would have denounced, radicals though they were, as hiding righteousness and sin.

The anglican "rebel rector" of Llanbedrog (he is really a Tory) reminded me of a kind of parable set out many years back by C. S. Lewis. It is the story of an infantryman who is on a fizzer for having neglected to keep his rifle clean. The soldier's answer is that keeping his rifle clean tends to egotism and that his prime task is to consider the company as a whole. We are told, in fact, to rid our minds of "sin" and take to our minds "anti-social behaviour". What a Pyrrhic victory is gained by the liberal mind of our time. It has asserted individual freedom (not the same as personal freedom, by the way) and has appeared to have gained such freedom only, at last, to find that it has gained nothing. Indeed, the liberal has toiled so hard as to lose liberalism under the euphemism of "anti-social behaviour". On that scheme of things Hitler did right to punish all German liberally-minded people (and there were probably many, even if Jerry dotes on uniforms and being ordered about). On that scheme of things, all Chinese who have ever supposed that a man might have certain rights, including his thinking in a certain manner, must be brainwashed. "Anti-social behaviour" sounds well enough to use because we breathe an air of liberal purity. So subtle is the tendency or drift that even Catholics are often hard put to it to defend an actual "authoritarian" order of the Church.

The World on the Pride of Life

Bring Holy Scripture to our aid. St. John the Beloved wrote quite plainly in the first of his Epistles: "Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world. If any man love

the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world is the concupiscence of the flesh and the concupiscence of the eyes and the pride of life which is not of the Father but is of the world" (I John 2, 15/16). St. James tells us in the first chapter of his general epistle that religion clean and undefiled is, among other things, "to keep oneself unspotted from this world".

What is "this world"? Is it worldly for a man and wife to look with desire upon each other? Not so. St. John was referring to that essentially worldly view of sexual life which perhaps even today we call "pagan" — at best, a sheer amorality. But the concupiscence of the flesh and the eye concerns so many other matters besides the sexual, a fact which is worth mentioning in our day when the subject of sex hag-rides us on all sides. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines the bible meaning as "desire for worldly things". Should we desire them? A hard question, but one which perhaps St. Louis, King of France, answered when he asked to be put on a bed of ashes as he was dying. There is a symbol of it, when a king to be crowned or a Pope to be crowned makes a token symbol of resistance. There is a story that when St. Pius X in conclave was becoming aware that he might be voted the new Pope, he begged the Lord with tears that this honour should be denied him. It is that spirit, which we of all conditions must try and possess with the help of God's grace.

But the sting is in St. John's reference to "the pride of life". It is this very pride concerning which I write. It is this pride which subtly lets us consider that the degrees set by "the world" (that "world" for which our Lord told us he did not pray) are not the degrees of the Lord God. In any case: "The glories of our birth and state are shadows, not substantial things"; as Shirley, the Cavalier poet, wrote. At best we must see all such matters as in *commendam* — by the grace of God to serve Caesar in Caesar's things, which are not by that token God's things altogether.

The Church and the World

The Catholic Church shows herself to the world in two antinomical ways: by separation from it and by a willingness to contribute to its culture — indeed, in times past, to build up a religion-culture. In the early days, it was absolutely necessary for the Church to show itself as opposed to the world, to keep itself unspotted from it. Later it realised that

there was an architectonic duty laid upon the Church; to save the world by, to some extent, accepting it. Then again, in the flight of holy men to the deserts, a time which included St. David of Wales, the Church saved the world by turning its back upon it. In our own time, it may well be that we should come to the conclusion that we must turn ourselves back upon the "pride of life" which is "of the world"; that "pride" which sets up human institutions as the guide-lines of Catholic Christian conduct and even church discipline.

The way called for by Vidler of the Cambridge modernists, the way of what he calls "holy worldliness", whatever that may have meant in past days, must have no good meaning for us today. I was trained up from my childhood as a Quaker to believe that God has planted a "seed" in all men, a light which enlightens all men and, as a Papist, I accept that fundamentally Catholic doctrine. But this is to see men rather than "the world". It is pertinent that the "Sixty Valiant Few" of the first Quakers were encratic and were bent upon despising the world and its follies without in any way recanting but rather re-asserting the Light within each man. They knew also that "if the Light within you be darkness, how great is that darkness" (Matthew 6.23). We must know that, just as there are St. Augustine's "two cities" which are "commingled", so those two cities are "commingled" in each man, who fights, with the help of the grace of Almighty God, that "city" sometimes called "the Old Adam", which is, once again, rightly called "the Pride of Life", but which has death for wages. The saints know of this better than we do; far, far better than Morien alias Pelagius who saw it so easy to be a saint. (What place would Pelagius have for St. Margaret of Cortona in his theology?)

There were days and there are still days when I have found it and shall continue to find it necessary to dwell upon what the Church has to say upon a just social order (I am almost weary of quoting *Mater et Magistra* in matters concerning Wales). But I never forget that the Church is not handing out advice which she has received from the world's pundits; asking us, indeed, to enjoy the pride of life which is of this world. Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* gives his categorical denial of "Socialism" — even "mitigated" Socialism — on the ground that Socialists conceived of this world as the end. Catholic Christians and others must always deny that worldly attitude. This world will pass away with its pride of life. It will be seen at last for its

heerly secular quality. But the liberal attitude seems never to have heard of the last four things. It bids us act as if Jerusalem was not the golden, but Babylon, a christianised Babylon perhaps, with Abide with Me sung loudly at football matches. Some years ago my old friend, Dr. Martyn Lloyd Jones, commenting upon the strange fervour of the 1904 religious revival in Wales, criticised it because it was crammed full of hymn singing but little in the way of preaching. And so today we in my land have our Gymanfa Ganu, a secularised institution in which tenor, bass, soprano and contralto groups sing great Welsh hymns for all the world as if they belonged to that other world, which in a special sense is the Christian's real world. This world is, after all, not the Christian world, not the world of the Christian goal.

Attack on Authority a Demand for Authority

But there is an aspect of the pride of life here and there which may easily pass our scrutiny. The first is that the quite apparent attack upon authority is paradoxically a demand for authority. This may pithily be expressed by commenting upon the quite common if hardly discerned liberality of liberals. There exists a "liberal" censorship more dangerous because not discerned, upon much that is sent for publication. Liberally-minded men in power may see to it that any writing or periodical which even implicitly attacks their strong position is as well as possible contained. A periodical such as *Christian Order* increases its circulation, but has to be published in a special manner for subscribers. That erudite periodical of Catholic thought, *Faith*, is not allowed to be on some Catholic bookstalls because it is supposed to be "conservative", which now means, such are semantics, subversive. Catholic writers of excellence are relegated and have to work hard to find some obscure publisher. It would not in the least surprise me to find a black list of periodicals and writers in the offices of leading Catholic journals and organs of communication. But the subtlety of it is that this censorship is not frank and open like that of, say, a so-called Fascist regime, or, for that matter, of a People's Republic. We have lived to see the day when those who have attacked censorship so strongly have set up a censorship of their own. They can no other; for to them their liberalism is sacrocanct; and it would be unsafe

for the regime were the bases of liberalism to be attacked.

Another subtle paradox is that those who seem to defy authority set up their own authority. If we are angry with the adolescents who roam the streets in gangs and who appear to be a menace to authority, do not be surprised to find some such notice painted on a wall: "Idwal, King of the Ystrad Skins". I saw such a notice on a railway station the other day. Underneath, there was another legend: "Ski Rule for Wales". Funny? Not so. Here is, indeed, a new authority, a usurped authority perhaps, but treason does never prosper for, if it does, none dare call it treason. Authority imposed by an age group is not by any means to be discounted and Wyndham Lewis' prophecy of a very serious age versus youth class war is already upon us with all the signs pointing to a victory for youthism. Here is a special pride of life which reminds me of that strange text in the Bible: "God delighteth not in the legs of a man". It is to be found in Psalm 146 where the Psalmist has praised God for all his benefits, but qualifies them by saying that God lifts up the meek and that, in not pleasuring in the legs of a man, He pleasures in them that fear him. Certainly, in that God makes a man's legs, God pleasures in them, but here is a comparison similar to that in which we are told not to put our trust in chariots or in princes. It is the kind of comparison which perhaps irritates us when we hear we are to "hate our parents for some greater good."

Democracy and Tyranny

Let me consider, if perhaps it be a slight digression, the distaste so many reasonable people have for authority because of the tyrants of our age. Those of us over fifty have good cause to be suspicious of authority because of what we have discerned in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. I ought to add the imperialist tyranny of Russia and China. (How many of us grasp that Russia and China have real empires?). I am not sure of the exact words of Acton; but I shall quote him. I believe he should be quoted: "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." Whig though he was, I feel that Acton was right. We do well to suspect powerful authority when we see it attempting to take overweening power. This authority may not be so palpable. Think of Chesterton's New Men who fight by shuffling papers. We do well on the whole in suspecting "The Board" and planning committees and their like.

No: it is not a digression, for it seems to me to reflect upon the curious fact that constituted authority today is no less so because its executors have largely shorn their robes and seem to be more Solonic than Draconic. Here comes Pascal — my Pascal, as some tell me. He tells us in his *Pensees* that people's imagination plays an enormous part in their obeisance to authority. You will find the argument repeated in several *Pensees* (in my tattered Penguin translation from number 289 to 313). For example, he tells us that duchies, kingships and magistracies being real and necessary exist everywhere and at all times. But since it is only imagination that entrusts them to one man or to another, there is no constancy in them. And: "The Chancellor is grave and wears chains of office, for his position is unreal".

Pascal does exaggerate. But there is that something in robes of office or the old fashioned helmet which seems largely to have disappeared from the heads of policemen. When I was young, young bloods from Oxford or Cambridge in boat-race night often tried to knock these helmets off. It was a sign of rebellion against authority. The peaked cap of the traffic warden and the policeman in his Panda lacks this symbolic strength. We despise authority, so many of us, and sometimes we have cause. If we abhorred some ancient tyranny, at least we feared it. Now we abhor constituted authority in another way. It is none the less likely to be tyrannous; but it bears the appearance of justice and careful administration — e.g., the queue for houses on council estates (though where I live we often comment on those who have contrived to jump that queue: is it because they know someone?)

Clerics and Religious who Downgrade

It is not, then, surprising, especially if we tend to look at the authority of the Church through the world's pride-of-life classes, to downgrade the authority of the bishop and the priest, who are often culpable. I detest this Tom, Dick and Harry notion of some modern priests who dress in mufti and seem to merit some such title as the President of the Assembly rather than priest. My Quaker wife was once asked by one such cleric to call him by his Christian name. She adamantly refused, though her tradition demanded she should rightly call him Friend. In the same way, a nun (or

whatever you call her), who has solemnly vowed to live the life of holy celibacy, poverty and obedience and who is clothed with a habit proper to such vows, dresses in mufti at her peril. She has in a special way dedicated her life to the service of the most Holy Trinity — a way that goes straight to the heart of the matter rather than by our indirect way, e.g. through marriage. It is unmannerly, tasteless, and partaking of "the world" to dress like a rather dowdy spinster (those I have seen in mufti look rather like that). They have, as Pascal observed, ignored imagination. It is no wonder that layfolk are smitten with the disease of downgrading. Burke was right in commenting in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*: "On that scheme of things a queen is but a woman and a woman is just a beast."

The Press and Downgrading

The downgrading of a bishop is largely due to the press. When a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster re-asserts the Church's teaching on, say, abortion, the press comes out with a headline: Cardinal Attacks Abortion. This is true; but it is misleading. We are, I am sure, meant to understand that the Cardinal is saying what he says off his own bat, so to speak. There is more than a hint that Cardinal Suenens might say something different. Of course, in the Church's long history bishops, save the bishops of Rome, have uttered what is erroneous. One may well imagine the popular press in the days when Nestorius was a great one. What, we may wonder, would such a press have made of his attack on the proposed dogma of Mary the Mother of God when he exclaimed that it was blasphemy to suppose that the Second Person in His Sacred Humanity supped at his holy mother's breast? Are we back in such times? Perhaps this is what Fleet Street thinks. If it so thinks, let bishops look to themselves—some of them—lest they appear to give credence to the notion that what a bishop says concerning faith and morals is his own pious opinion, rather than what the Church teaches.

Then we of the laity must ask ourselves, we who nurture Fleet Street, whether we are not somewhat to blame. When I became a convert, I felt many embarrassments in matters of bodily posturing; but I have lived to see the day when a very good friend of mine, a bishop, would come to see me in hospital and I would be over-glad to kneel to kiss his ring.

These matters are very important indeed. "It is not the guards who make the discipline; it is the discipline that makes the guards". And we layfolk are soldiers, even if we are in the Pays Corps or the Pioneers.

Another weak spot in our armoury is our permitting ourselves as the Church Militant to let people get away with such stuff as posing leading questions such as "Will The Church Survive"? This usually comes with reference to "this day and age" (a cliché meriting a special limbo). But it is not the right question. The real question is: "Will the World Survive"? Thank God, much of the Church has already survived. It is in Heaven enjoying the vision of God or suffering triumphantly in Purgatory. When the Lord comes again there may be not much faith left upon the earth amid the pride of life — indeed, holy Scripture tells us so. (S. Luke 18, 8). But the Church will survive while the world with its pride of life will pass away. Our acceptance of the authority of the Church is a corollary of her guaranteed survival; but it is a time to assert our acceptance of her authority, our acceptance also of the Word of God, our acceptance of our hope firmly grounded as an anchor because the Hope, which is the theological virtue, is not one that which the world understands as such, a word suggesting doubt or condition.

Pilgrims in the World

But what is all this based upon? Is it not founded upon what Holy Church has conserved in the words of Scripture concerning Our Lord: "He taught them with authority and not as the scribes" (Matthew 7, 29). I have quoted the A.V. version. Our's says "with power"; but this is of small moment, for although the words are not synonymous they have the same force in this context. The point is that He did not teach as "the scribes"; and we know how many of those there are about us these days. They are men and women who are often said to be "leading" and even said to be "authoritative". But we are to beware of them, Our Lord told us. And beware we do, let me hope. We remain pilgrims in "the world". We march to a city not made with hands and we have in our hands a scroll which no worldly scribe has penned and a mark upon our foreheads which is a sign of our eternal destiny.

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

In today's confrontations within the Church, the one side uses "Tradition" as a shield and the other side uses "Tradition" as a bludgeon. Which is the true Tradition?

The simple, and correct, answer is that the true Tradition conveys the substance of faith and morals and is continuous from the days of the Apostles until the end of time. All Catholics must be traditionalists, for they must keep the Faith.

The term "traditionalist", used as a condemnation, refers to the externals of faith and to what is supposed to be a stupid and stubborn attachment to them in spite of the need to allow them to change with the times. An attachment to a form of religious habit which used to be ordinary everyday dress centuries ago but which nowadays looks like fancy dress or a museum piece would be that kind of questionable traditionalism. But it is wrong to separate faith from the externals of religion as though they were not intimately connected, and as though faith can stay untouched while the externals are being everlastingly brought up to date. The externals grow out of faith as its expression; and to scrap them or modify them recklessly is to put the faith in danger. The externals of liturgy are never trivial. They have been adopted as worthy of the very substance of Tradition and Tradition itself could be obscured or diluted by change in practice. The central position on our altars of the altar (not the table) of sacrifice, the surrounding of the sanctuary by the Holy of Holies, with rails, the tabernacle as the focal point of worship, the step on which communicants can kneel to adore the Word-made-flesh, the receiving of the Host on the tongue — those traditions of practice are rooted in Tradition. The Protestant "Reformers" knew that, and they used their knowledge to attack Tradition. How can the present promoters of archaisms and novelties in our Catholic liturgy be ignorant of it?

I have come across this statement in a parish newsletter: "As people suffering from coeliac disease cannot take Communion Hosts containing gluten, gluten-free hosts are available for them". Does this statement imply a denial of transubstantiation?

No, By the power of Christ, acting through and in a validly ordained priest, the substance of the bread becomes the substance of the Body of Christ (the whole Christ). But the consecrated Host has all the "accidents" of bread, as you can verify from your own experience — size, shape, colour, taste, feel, appearance. What is no longer there, after the Consecration, is the underlying reality of bread which, until the moment before, had supported those "accidents". That is the primary miracle and mystery of transubstantiation. The secondary miracle is that those "accidents" exist without a supporting substance: they are not "accidents" of the Body of Christ.

The idea of "accidents" is not usually formulated except in philosophy, but it is straightforward enough. All those words, "size, shape, etc." imply a reality that they are "of" — size of, shape of, colour of. We can't even think of them as independent — shape, size, without the reality which they are the shape and size of. That reality is called "substance" — sub, under, and stare, to stand.

From the beginning, the Church has taught the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. The explanation of the way in which Christ becomes really present has to be consistent with the manifest presence of the externals of bread. The use of the word "substance" appears quite early in official teaching. In 1079, Berengarius had to make a solemn profession of faith, in Rome, that "the bread and wine . . . are . . . substantially changed into the true and real and life-giving flesh and blood of Jesus Christ Our Lord". That doctrine is infallible and has many times been reaffirmed.

As you know, the hosts have to be made of fine wheaten flour, sieved. The husk and much of the grain are extracted. The further extraction of a tiny quantity of the protein, gluten, can be effected without the hosts ceasing to be bread.

It is impossible to defend the indefectibility of the Church when ecclesiastics of high authority publicly deny articles of faith and/or allow others to deny them with impunity. Does not even a Sovereign Pontiff become implicated in heresy if he allows its propagation?

Certainly we find ourselves plunged into long, laborious and somewhat shame-faced defences of the indefectibility of the Church in these days when "high ecclesiastics" can be found who publicly deny or allow to be denied doctrines which are part of the deposit of faith, such as that the Mass is a true Sacrifice, that papal definitions of faith and morals are irreformable, that Christ rose from the dead in his own body and by his own power, that the sacrificing priesthood is conferred only by the sacrament of order and is different in kind from the priesthood of the baptized, that abortion, contraception and homosexuality are intrinsically evil . . . you name it: it has been denied.

But the indefectibility of the Church is a fact, however hard it may be to get an unbeliever to see it as a fact. Those denied doctrines are still truth, and they will always be the faith of the Church. It is impossible that the Pope or a Council, using the extraordinary magisterium, should deny them implicitly or explicitly. The Holy Ghost cannot contradict Himself.

"High ecclesiastics", heretics, or aiders and abettors of heresy, are not the Church. It would be edifying to have exact statistics of such ecclesiastics who have fallen into heresy and been condemned. The list would be fairly long, and would include English bishops from the days of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Pope Honorius was condemned for carelessness and lack of firmness in dealing with heresy. Fear, self-interest, indolence, and even a taste for heresy may affect high ecclesiastics; but they do not affect the Holy Ghost or the teaching of the Church.

But, as you say, how convince an unbeliever!

Book Review

AUTHORITY WITHOUT TEETH?

Truth and Authority — A Commentary on the Agreed Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission — Venice 1976 by E. J. Yarnold, S.J., and Henry Chadwick (CTS/SPCK 1977, 70p).

1. Infallibility

This Commentary has, of course, even less authority than the Agreed Statement on *Authority in the Church*; and that presently enjoys only the authority of the Commission which drafted it. But although the Commentary has little or no authority, it does reveal some disturbing truths about the way Church leaders are thinking.

Infallibility, of the Church, of the Pope, remains a Roman Catholic dogma but it is increasingly suggested — at least outside the Roman obedience — that the form in which it was expressed in 1870 is an embarrassment to Roman Catholics today, and that *Papal Infallibility*, at any rate, while unlikely explicitly to be repudiated, will soon be "put into mothballs" and never again see the light of day. So Austin Farrer was able to write: "We must see that the Latin theologian is simply not in a position to write infallibility off; he is obliged to save the name even if he virtually drops the thing . . . And perhaps if we are to put ecumenism first, then instead of carping at infallibility we ought to join in the game of giving it a false beard and whiskers, while merely making sure that it hasn't got any teeth". (1) Is that how the ecumenical game is played?

Is that the tenor of Agreed Statement and Commentary? The Statement (24(c)) observes: "For the Roman Catholic Church the pope's dogmatic definitions, which, fulfilling the criteria of infallibility (this is hedged round by very rigorous conditions), are preserved from error, do no more but no less than express the mind of the Church on issues concerning the divine revelation" (2) Then what of the affirmation of 1870 that papal definitions are "irreformable of themselves, not because of the consent of the Church"? These words, says the Commentary, are "easily misunderstood. The intention was neither to exempt the universal primate from the

obligation to inquire into the mind of the Church . . . nor to claim that such definitions are the Church's last word in any matter, permitting no restatement in other terms". Fr. Robert Murray, S.J., earlier remarked: "What is excluded is his (the Pope's) dependence on subsequent approval, not his need of previous consultation. The reason why the subsequent consent of the Church is excluded as a condition is that it is understood to be unnecessary; the guarantee of infallibility entails that *nothing will be solemnly defined which is not the faith of the Church*" (3). This looks like an argument in a circle: the Pope is obliged to consult, though the definition does not say so, and it does not say so because the Pope is guaranteed against defining anything which is not the faith of the Church anyway? Or does the one omission have quite a different significance from the other?

2) The Church and "the Churches"

At this point we are bound to ask what is meant by THE CHURCH which is to be consulted? Are we talking about the Church of Rome alone? This would seem to be the logical inference, for at most the Papal and Marian dogmas (not to mention pronouncements on moral issues like *Humanae Vitae*) can only claim to have reflected the mind of that Communion.

Here the Statement (24(b)) is less than explicit: "If it were further implied that as long as a church is not in communion with the bishop of Rome, it is regarded by the Roman Catholic Church as less than fully a church, a difficulty would remain: for some this difficulty would be removed by simply restoring communion, but to others the implication would itself be an obstacle to entering into communion with Rome". (4).

The Commentary, however, asks whether by being out of communion with the universal primate a "church" must be regarded as simply a deceit and a counterfeit. It admits that: "The language of controversy in the past has at times indicated that Roman Catholic controversialists are inclined to give an affirmative answer to this question". (Yes, indeed!) As recently as 1960, Bishop B. C. Butler (a member of ARCIC) was writing: "There are two major Christian Communions that claim, each for itself, to be *exclusively the true continuation of the Church of apostolic times and Christian antiquity: the communion of the Eastern Orthodox churches*

and the Catholic communion centered in the Pope, the Bishop of Rome". He then proceeds to resolve the problem in favour of Rome. (6) However, the Commentary under review asserts: "Pope Paul VI's reference to the Anglican Communion as a sister church, in his homily on the occasion of the canonisation of the English and Welsh martyrs, on 25 October, 1970 shows that this approach is no longer representative".

Yet, as recently as 1973, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued "A Declaration In Defence Of The Catholic Doctrine On The Church Against Certain Errors Of The Present Day" (*Mysterium Ecclesiae*). In this document the Vatican expressly states that the Church of Christ "constituted and organized in this world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the Successor of St. Peter and the bishops in union with that Successor . . . The followers of Christ are therefore not permitted to imagine that Christ's Church is nothing more than a collection . . . of Churches and ecclesial communities. Nor are they free to hold that Christ's Church nowhere really exists today and that it is to be considered only as an end which all Churches and ecclesial communities must strive to reach . . ." *The Wanderer*, 24.6.76.

The question is of immense importance, not only for determining how many of the General Councils are to be recognized as truly ecumenical and authoritative, but for the mutual recognition of members and ministries proposed by The Churches' Unity Commission. Once a denomination be recognized as "fully a Church" must not the validity of its ministrations be recognised also? In the event of reconciliation with Rome must the specifically Roman dogmas be accepted by "Churches" which previously rejected them? Fr. Robert Murray, S.J., claiming that the Catholic Church had gone far in recognizing "both the full ecclesial status and the authenticity of doctrinal witness of the Orthodox Church" has suggested that, for example, Rome might ask the East "to respect the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as a formulation valid for the Latin West" (5) but would allow them to be content with their way of expressing Our Lady's role in the economy of salvation. A future "united council" might find a unified formula . . . Does this suggest a general theological pattern for unity without absorption?

Again it must be stressed that the whole question of the Church and "the Churches" has to be clarified clearly and unequivocally if further ecumenical progress is to be entertained!

3) Revelation

Writing in 1970, Bishop McAdoo (Anglican Co-Chairman of ARCIC), referred to Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation as not finally opting for either the one-source or the two-source view of Revelation, but since it allowed for the former it encouraged Roman Catholic scholars who held the material sufficiency of Scripture and regarded the function of tradition as hermeneutical. (5) Though the Agreed Statement tends to obscurity on this point, its omissions favour the former point of view, and the Commentary is more explicit: "The true account of the relation between Scripture and tradition does not lie either in a literal *Scriptura sola* theory, or in a theory of 'Scripture plus tradition': but rather a genuine tradition is always an interpretation of Scripture, and Scripture is accepted according to the interpretation of the Church's tradition".

Once again we come up against what is meant by *the Church*. Is it not arguable that *Roman Catholic* tradition has been formed and controlled by another conception of tradition, once respectable and even dominant, which Rome now appears anxious to modify, and by a discipline which she is now relaxing? And with Biblical scholarship in its present disarray, with no consensus even among Roman Catholics, must it not be tradition rather than Scripture which is definitive? Consider, for example, the Pope's exclusion of the possibility of the ordination of women when a majority of the Pontifical Biblical Commission could find no *Scriptural* justification for his attitude. (Admittedly, in this case, the Pope could — if he wished — appeal to a wider tradition than that of his own Communion).

4) Attitudes to Conflicting Views: Authority without Teeth?

Conceding to the contemporary emphasis upon pluralism or "pluriformity", Rome is prepared to acknowledge theological attitudes which are "complementary but not conflicting". But what of her attitude to denominations which openly admit to conflicting schools of thought, even in respect

of basic doctrine and of basic understandings of the nature of religious thought, which propose to contain those who repudiate any firm positions and argue that in the nature of the case fixed and definite positions are inadmissible? For example, a leading Anglican theologian, Prof. Maurice Wiles, quotes with approval from the Roman Catholic theologian, Karl Rahner: "The quantitative increase in theological pluralism over the centuries has produced, as it were, a *qualitative mutation*. The present pluralism is quite different from the old pluralism". And Wiles goes on: "If the truth about God made known in Jesus Christ is something for which we have continuously to search, then we ought not to try to tie it down . . . We need . . . to be ready to be at one with all those who are ready to be at one with us in the name of Christ . . . There are theological cases for papal, episcopal, presbyteral and congregational forms of Church Order. Just because the cases have a theological dimension, each has frequently been worked out in a form that makes absolute and exclusive claims for its own particular order. *But it is precisely this that the newer approach to theology will not allow us to do*". (6) This seems to have interesting ecumenical implications, for if we cannot expect to be united in beliefs, worship, Church Order (nor yet in ethical attitudes) and if there can be no permanent solutions—then just what is all the fuss about?

Rome seems no longer to excommunicate those who depreciate her dogmas. Is this development a matter of tactics or of conviction? The Commentary says: "An individual theologian may feel . . . obliged . . . to adopt a position that conflicts . . . with office and institutional authority . . . He may then appear a heretic . . . Nevertheless in the long run the truth that he has seen may be that which the Church comes to acknowledge as her own"!

5) Conclusion

The Commentary offers what may seem a pleasing prospect to many Anglicans: "If the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church were ever united . . . The Anglican Communion would be a patriarchate, in full communion with the Roman See . . . enjoy(ing) its own canon law, just as do the Uniate Churches in communion with Rome

today". This would be less attractive to other Anglicans anxious to achieve some form of unity with Protestant denominations at an early date, on terms which would compromise Catholic doctrine and practice in respect of the Ministry and Sacraments. That Roman Catholics should advise Anglicans that the latter course would not impair their chances of closer relations with Rome is incomprehensible, though the motivation may be that long-term prospects of negotiation at once with larger numbers is regarded as outweighing any more immediate advantage with a smaller group. Here again, this is surely to reduce ecumenism to tactics and manoeuvres!

Indeed, at this point we may ask whether our ecumenical exercises are really tending to edify the faithful or to cast doubt upon the content of faith and upon the credibility of any and every "Church". Reviewing the rapidity of change and the shifts of emphasis of recent years, is not any "Agreed Statement" outdated almost before the ink is dry? Only yesterday Vatican II men were thought progressive: now anyone who has stood still since 1965 is regarded as a Vatican I man in new clothes! Bill McSweeney expressed the concern of many when he wrote:—

"Despite condemnations of 'dogmatic relativism', there is no doubt that . . . faith has escaped control and heresy is at an end . . . The cultural relativism that characterizes pluralist writing effectively empties beliefs of their content by according them equal status and validity and reducing all conflict to problems of language, problems of translation. What began as a laudable concern to heal divisions among Christians is thus transformed into a simpleminded search for the unity of mankind. The effect is not unity but atomism (7)"

Rev. Francis D. Moss

1. *Infallibility in the Church* D.L.T. 1968.
2. *Authority in the Church* CTS/SPCK 20p.
3. *Infallibility in the Church* D.L.T. 1968.
4. *Why Christ* Libra Book.
5. *New Divinity* (art.) November 1970.
6. *Theology* January 1974.
7. *The Times* 16 October 1976.